

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

The Classical Review

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.

C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3, The University, Glasgow, W. 2

All correspondence should be addressed to Mr. FORDYCE.

Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management:

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A. (Chairman), representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

J. G. BARRINGTON-WARD, M.A.

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A.

Prof. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A.

F. H. SANDBACH, M.A.

Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A. (Hon. Treasurer).

Representing the Council of the Classical Association.

E. A. BARBER, M.A. (Hon. Secretary), representing the Oxford Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. TENNEY FRANK, Johns Hopkins University, Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, and Prof. W. J. WOODHOUSE, University of Sydney.

Vol. XLIX

MAY, 1935

No. 2

CONTENTS

	PAGE
NOTES AND NEWS	49
THREE RESTORATIONS IN AESCHYLUS <i>Persae</i> . A. Y. CAMPBELL	50
A NOTE ON PLATO'S ASTRONOMY. A. E. TAYLOR	53
NOTE ON VIRGIL, <i>Aen.</i> VII. 626 F. T. FINNE- GAN	57
THUCYDIDES IV. 48. 4. R. E. WYCHERLEY..	57
NOTE ON EPICURUS (<i>Gnomologium Vaticanum</i> , No. LXXXI). K. HORN	58
<i>Tam magnus</i> . W. A. LAIDLAW	59
SENECA, <i>Ep.</i> 47, 9. W. L. LORIMER	59

REVIEWS:

Die Geographie des homerischen Epos (Hennig), J. L. MYRES, 60; *Stilistische Untersuchungen zu Hesiod* (Sellschopp), T. A. SINCLAIR, 60; *Saffo e Pindaro* (Perrotta); *Der Dichter und sein Gott bei den Griechen und Römern* (Falter), C. M. BOWRA, 61; *Die Melodie zu Pindars erstem pythischen Gedicht* (Friedländer), J. F. MOUNTFORD, 62; *Die Logaoëen* (Kolár), J. A. DAVISON, 63; *Sofocle: Aiace* (Untersteiner), A. S. OWEN, 64; *Aristophanes in English Verse*, Vol. II (Way), A. S. OWEN, 64; *Wanderarzt und Aitiologie* (Diller), A. L. PECK, 65; *Platon: La République, livres iv-x* (Chambray), A. L. PECK, 66; *Aristotle: The Physics*, Vol. II (Wicksteed and Cornford), G. R. G. MORE, 66; *Aristotele: La Poetica* (Albeggiani), C. G. HARDIE, 67; *The Geography of Strabo*, Vol. VIII (Jones), *Athenaeus, The Deipnosophists* Vol. V (Gulick), E. HARRISON, 68; *Orpheus and Greek Religion* (Guthrie), H. J. ROSE, 68; *Quaestiones Orphicae* (Krueger), W. K. C. GUTHRIE, 69; *Griechische Religiosität von Alexander d. Gr. bis auf Prohlos* (Nestle), H. J. ROSE, 70; *Porphyrus und Augustin* (Theiler), E. R. DODDS, 71; *Life and Letters*

REVIEWS (continued):

	PAGE
<i>in the Papyri</i> (Winter); <i>Select Papyri</i> (Hunt and Edgar), W. M. CALDER, 72; <i>Literary Criticism in Antiquity</i> (Atkins), J. TATE, 73; <i>Der Humanismus</i> (Drerup), R. W. LIVINGSTONE, 75; <i>A Biography of the Greek People</i> , (Lavell), A. W. GOMME, 75; <i>Megarische Studien</i> (Hanell), M. N. TOD, 76; <i>Dion</i> (von Scheliha), R. HACKFORTH, 77; <i>Minor Latin Poets</i> (J. Wight Duff and A. M. Duff), A. E. HOUSMAN, 78; <i>Seventy Odes of Horace translated into English verse</i> (Mayor), E. S. FORSTER, 79; <i>Carmina Horatii selecta in usum iuventutis studiosae ad modos aptata</i> (Wagner), H. J. W. TILLYARD, 80; <i>Virgil the Necromancer</i> (Spargo), H. J. ROSE, 81; <i>Propertius, Elegie scelte</i> (Terzaghi); <i>Elegie scelte</i> (Cesareo), O. L. RICHMOND, 81; <i>Valerius Flaccus with an English translation</i> (Mozley), R. J. GETTY, 82; <i>M. Tulli Ciceronis Tusculanarum Disputationum libri quinque</i> (Dougan and Henry), E. J. WOOD, 84; <i>Il Satyricon di Petronio</i> (Paratore), W. B. SEDGWICK, 85; <i>Epochen der römischen Geschichte</i> (Altheim), A. F. GILES, 86; <i>Notes on the History of Ancient Roads and their Construction</i> (Forbes), C. E. STEVENS, 87; <i>A First Latin Course</i> (Barnard); <i>Latin for Today</i> (McEvoy and Dale); <i>Foundations for Greek Prose Composition</i> (Lewis and Styler), H. LISTER, 88; <i>Latin Fundamentals</i> (Hettich and Maitland); <i>Latin Prose Composition</i> (Wormald); <i>Sensim, Book III</i> (Wormald); <i>The Fourth Book of Virgil's Aeneid</i> (Butler), C. W. BATY, 89 60-89	
SHORT REVIEWS	89
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	91
BOOKS RECEIVED	94

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present number, 2s. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 10s., *Quarterly* 13s.; combined subscription £1 1s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. F. C. G. Langford, c/o The Triangle Offices. Inquiries should be sent to The Triangle Offices, 61, South Molton Street, W. 1, addressed either to the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Mr. R. M. Rattenbury and Professor T. B. L. Webster) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz., Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, East Anglia, Cardiff, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

The Loeb Classical Library

EDITED BY

T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D. E. CAPP, PH.D., LL.D. W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.

Each volume, Foolsap 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net. Leather, 12s. 6d. net.

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

‘We shall never be independent of our Loeb.’—TIMES LIT. SUPP.

List of Books published, May and June, 1935

Latin

- 292. *Celsus. DE MEDICINA.* Translated by Dr. W. G. SPENCER. Two volumes. Vol. I.
- 293. *Cicero. VERRINE ORATIONS.* Translated by L. H. G. GREENWOOD. Two volumes. Vol. II.
- 294. *Remains of Old Latin.* Translated by E. H. WARMINGTON. Three volumes. Vol. I., ENNIUS AND CAECILIUS.
- 295. *Livy.* Translated by B. O. FOSTER and E. SAGE. Thirteen volumes. Vol. IX.

Greek

- 285. *Aristotle. ATHENIAN CONSTITUTION, EUDEMIAN ETHICS, and VIRTUES AND VICES.* Translated by H. RACKHAM.
- 287. *Aristotle. METAPHYSICS, BOOKS X-IV.* Translated by H. TREDENNICK. *OECONOMICA* and *MAGNA MORALIA*, translated by G. CYRIL ARMSTRONG.
- 288. *Aristotle. On the Soul, PARVA NATURALIA, On Breath.* Translated by W. S. HETT.
- 297, 298. *Pausanias.* Translated by W. H. S. JONES. Four volumes. Vol. IV. Vol. V, a companion volume of maps, plans and descriptions arranged by R. E. WYCHERLEY.
- 289. *Philo.* Translated by F. H. COLSON. Nine volumes. Vol. VI.
- 290. *Procopius.* Translated by H. B. DEWING. Seven volumes. Vol. VI. *THE SECRET HISTORY.*
- 291. *Sextus Empiricus.* Translated by R. G. BURY. Three volumes. Vol. II.

Machines or Mind? (an introduction to the Loeb Classical Library).

Free together with Descriptive Prospectus, &c.

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

1
1
1
0
2

1
-
5
2
2
2
1
1

2.
0
1.
..
-9,
4,
-
1,
1,

T
Pear
Gree
had
barr
one
tent
of Z
of S
finis
sam
deep
mer
Sop
mer
He
hate
bril
at t
bus
nat
his
the
of t
reve

T
suc
from
lect
civi
afte
exc
Ar
gra
aut
effi
A
fall
vot
dea
and
lec
slid
and
evi
He
arc
Do

The Classical Review

MAY, 1935

NOTES AND NEWS

THE long illness of Alfred Chilton Pearson, who was Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge from 1921 to 1928, had for some years before his death debarred from the practice of scholarship one of its most powerful and least pretentious masters. From his early edition of Zeno and Cleanthes to the Oxford text of Sophocles which he was just able to finish, all his work was marked by the same rare combination of wide reading, deep thought, and independent judgment, and his great publication of the Sophoclean fragments is such a monument as many dream but few achieve. He never chose easy themes, and he hated facile generalization and empty brilliance. His varieties of experience at the Bar, in school teaching, and in business administration fortified the natural sobriety of his genius, and in his later years he stood out as one of the few living scholars in the full stream of the great English tradition which he revered and loved.

The Classical Association held a most successful meeting at Southampton from April 8th to 11th, 1935. Besides lectures, those who attended enjoyed a civic and an academic reception, an afternoon on the *Berengaria*, and an excursion to Bignor, Porchester, and Arundel. They owe a deep debt of gratitude to the college and civic authorities for a warm welcome and efficient arrangements.

As the bimillenary of Horace's birth falls in this year, two lectures were devoted to him. Professor J. F. Dobson dealt with Maecenas' relations to Horace and Virgil in a witty and stimulating lecture; Professor J. D. Craig showed slides of a bust in the Soane Museum and presented an admirable array of evidence to prove it a portrait of Horace. There were two lectures on archaeological subjects. Mrs. Dina P. Dobson aroused the keenest interest

by her description of Roman objects which have been found in Scandinavia and her discussion of the reasons for their coming there. Dr. F. Saxl, the Director of the Warburg Institute, kindly accepted the invitation of the Association to attend its meeting and explained the methods and ideals of his Institute in an admirable lecture on 'the Origin and Survival of a Pictorial Type (the Mithras reliefs).' Greek literature formed the subject of two lectures, 'Character-drawing in Sophocles' by Professor T. B. L. Webster and 'Plutarch's Version of the Cult of Isis and Osiris' by Miss N. M. Holley. The latter was a detailed and sympathetic interpretation of Plutarch's views in the light of the literary and archaeological evidence. Professor T. A. Sinclair opened the academic proceedings by a general discussion of the use of foreign languages in the ancient world, in which he surveyed the whole question from the time of Homer to the time of Augustus. The academic proceedings were closed by the presidential address in which Dr. Cyril Bailey traced the history of the idea of Fate through Greek and Roman literature, starting with Homer and ending with Virgil. At the dinner at New Hall, Swaythling, Dr. J. W. Mackail was the guest of honour and told the members of the past history of the Association and gave them encouragement for the future.

The Fourth International Congress of Papyrology will have taken place in Florence before this note appears. Though the date, the end of April and the beginning of May, was inconvenient for teachers in this country, the programme promised papers by Mr. H. I. Bell and Mr. W. G. Waddell, and a third which was cancelled by the death of John Undershell Powell, of whom a contributor writes as follows:

'He was not of course primarily a papyrologist; he was just an extraordinarily fine Greek scholar, of a type which is perhaps particularly English and also, it is to be feared, rather old-fashioned. He was never restless to exhibit his knowledge or make a stir. He was not only a very modest man, he was a contented man; happy in Greek literature, in scholarship and in teaching. It was an instructive experience to watch Powell dealing with a pupil's composition, the eager pursuit of the right phrase and the raising of the standard higher and higher. Consequently when new facts or new problems presented themselves, through papyri or otherwise, Powell, with his rare command of the literature and language, knew where to place them and how to explain them. Hence the series of *New Chapters in Greek Literature* and the beautiful and almost impeccable *Collectanea Alexandrina*.'

The publication by the Clarendon Press of Professor Eduard Fraenkel's inaugural lecture on *Greece and Roman Culture* (see p. 95) gives us an opportunity of welcoming a distinguished scholar on his appointment to the chair of Latin at Oxford. Dr. Fraenkel's main thesis is that while the influence of Greek culture on civilizations other than Roman produced only a mixture of Greek elements with indigenous qualities, Roman culture was an indissoluble fusion, an organic whole in which latent Roman potentialities were actualized by the imposition of Greek forms upon them. His treatment of so wide a subject in so short a space is bound to be general, but he makes no generalization which is not supported and illuminated by example from language or literature, history or art. The learning, insight and sobriety of judgement with which his thesis is developed make the lecture a notable achievement of humanistic interpretation.

THREE RESTORATIONS IN AESCHYLUS PERSAE.

163 AND CONTEXT. (A PROPOS OF C.R. XLVIII 4-8.)

- (XO.) μήτερ ἢ Ξέρξου γεραῖά, χαῖρε, Δαρείου 156
 γόναι.
 θεοῦ μὲν εὐνείειρα Περσῶν, θεοῦ δὲ καὶ
 μήτερ ἔφης,
 εἰ τι μὴ δαίμων παλαιὸς νῦν μεθέστηκε
 στρατῷ.
 AT. ταῦτα δὲ λιποῦσ' ἰκάνω χρυσεοστόλμους 160
 δόμους
 καὶ τὸ Δαρείου τε κάμυν κοινὸν εὐνατήριον.
 κἀμὲ καρδιαν ἀμύσσει φροντίς· ἐς δ' ὑμᾶς
 ἐρῶ
 μῦθον, οὐδαμῶς ἑμάντης οὐδ' ἀδείμαντος,
 φίλοι,
 μὴ μέγαν πῶλος κορίσας οὐδας ἀντρέψῃ ποδὶ
 δλβον, ὃν Δαρείος ἦεν οὐκ ἀνευ θεῶν τινός.
 ταῦτά μοι διπλὴ μέριμνα θρακτὸς ἐστίν ἐν
 φρεσὶ. 165
 μήτ' ἀχρημάτοις λαμπρὴν φῶσιν δ σθένης
 πάρα, 167
 μήτε χρημάτων ἀνάνδρων πλῆθος ἂν τιμὴν
 σχεθεῖν. 166
 ἔστι γὰρ πλοῦτός γ' ἀμεμφής, ἀμφὶ δ' ὀφ-
 θαλμῷ φόβος·
 ὄμμα γὰρ δόμων νομίζω δεσπότης παρῶναι.
 πρὸς τὰδ' κτλ.
 161 καμὲ] καί με codd., corr. Bothe.
 163 μέγαν πῶλος] μέγας πλοῦτος codd., correxi.
 165 μέριμνα θρακτὸς Meineke, μέριμν' ἀφραστos
 codd.
 166 post 167 traí. A. Ludwig, rec. Wecklein.
 167 φῶσιν δ] φῶς δσος codd., corr. Lawson.
 166 ἂν τιμὴν σχεθεῖν scripsi, ἐν τιμῇ σέβειν codd.
 168 ὀφθαλμῷ Heimsoeth monente Hermannō,
 ὀφθαλμοῖς codd.

162-4. It is the old story: hyperbaton; *hinc illae lacrimae*; and here there were two hyperbata, both deliberate. ἑμάντης depends upon πῶλος; for 'my own colt' of Xerxes compare 'Agamemnon's colt' (also complete with chariot, and attended by prayers that his course may be *steady*) of Orestes in *Cho.* 794, and 'Strymon's colt' (also a θεός and πῶλος in one) of Rhesus in *Eur. Rh.* 386. But after μήτερ Ξέρξου and θεοῦ μήτηρ, ἐμὸς πῶλος would have been enough; the reason why we have the reflexive, and why, even at that, ἑμάντης is trajected right outside the clause to a position well in front of it, is that the genitive goes ἀπὸ κοινοῦ both with πῶλος and with μέγαν δλβον.¹ The same is also the reason why the words from μέγαν to δλβον are placed exactly as they are. Since ἑμάντης cannot depend upon ἀδείμαντος,² the Grecian

¹ Cf. e.g. *Agam.* 1578 βροτῶν τιμαύρους . . . ἀχῇ. For hyperbaton, there is a far more violent example at *Eur. Tro.* 1173 κρατὸς . . . 1175 βόστρυχον.

² That would mean 'afraid of (or at) myself,' cf. e.g. *P.V.* 416, *Soph. Tr.* 23, *O.T.* 885.

ear instinctively attaches it to μέγαν (and awaits the substantive), and πῶλος by such juxtaposition acquires its similar determination. The fact is that, as καὶ μέ shows, ἐμαντής would be required in this context by μέγαν ὄλβον even apart from πῶλος. μέγας ὄλβος I find in tragedy nine times, six of these in the accusative, and one of these latter in this play and with this identical¹ reference, 826; the others are *Agam.* 751-2, *Cho.* 865 (πατέρων), *Soph. fr.* 106, 593, *Eur. H.F.* 511, *Ion* 703, *Or.* 340, 807. It is the regular phrase for family wealth, particularly as inherited, so that the epithet in our passage is not idle but almost necessary.² The first step in the corruption was perhaps that μέγαν was assimilated to the neighbouring nominative,³ and when the classic sense of hyperbaton became lost, as our MSS so often show that it did, and ἐμαντής was therefore presumably (as by moderns) vaguely attached to ἀδείμαντος, this 'great colt' seemed a ridiculous intruder and the context (or a marginal gloss on ὄλβον) suggested the rank interpolation (i.e. supposed correction) πλούτος. Alternatively, a paraphrase explaining the construction may have lent μὴ μέγαν πλούτον, to be turned into the required nominative later.

The Homeric phrase κούσαι πεδίου or πεδίοιο, to *stampede*, is used of men as well as of horses, but it is only the horse who by doing so can overthrow something else, rider or chariot; here the ὄλβος must be his ἄρμα, compare *Cho.* 794 ff. cited above, and explicitly *Eur. H.F.* 779 f. ἔθραυσεν ὄλβον κελαινὸν ἄρμα. A *restive* horse is characteristically a πῶλος, cf. *P.V.* 1010, *Soph. El.* 725, *fr.* 848, *Eur. Or.* 45, *fr.* 821; and as applied to a person, *Plat. Gorg.* 463E (cf. *Pers.* 782), *Ar. Rhet.* ii, 23, 29. And πῶλος is absolutely⁴ the only word

which will also explain ἐμαντής. Moreover it was in any case Xerxes (and not the στόλος which he led nor the baneful δαίμων which infuriated him) who specifically wrecked his father's fortune, cf. 750-2. If all this together be not reasonable demonstration, then nothing is.

Previous proposals never had a leg to stand on. Lawson's πότμος was anticipated by Skutsch, and has been (with a 'frustra') in the apparatus of Groeneboom's edition since 1930. The new Liddell and Scott, s.v. ἀνατρέπω, positively quotes this line with δαίμων for πλούτος and never a hint that that is not the MS reading.⁵ Heimsoeth's δαίμων, despite 158 and 725, is bad; it not only fails to explain κούσας οὐδας, but it presents the disconcerting irrelevancy of an inevitable antithesis with θεῶν τινός; why should Heaven undo what Heaven had done, or what could be the point of saying so here? πότμος is open to the same objections.

Once again, if πῶλος needed further confirmation, it must get it from the general reflection which follows. Hitherto lines 165-7 have stultified their initial ταῦτά μοι by presenting no sort of rational deduction from anything that has preceded. 'Money is not enough; men also are needed; the fortune is nothing without the man.' We have heard about wealth, and we have heard this or that about deities, but nothing of men except a glance at Darius, which seems inadequate. Fortunately the Greek mind (e.g. Plato *passim*) habitually reverts to the 'pole' from which it started; repeats the first term of an antithesis or re-states a connexion. 168 thus gives the clue to 161-4. The patrimony itself is beyond cavil, it is the *man* that I am anxious about. Darius was a man, but we do not look upon his like again. If Xerxes is not a man

¹ And with μέγαν ὄλβ. δν Δ. ἤρεν compare 754 f. σὺ μὲν μέγαν τέκνους πλούτον ἐκτίσας.

² For women (especially widows) speaking of the wealth as their own cf. *Soph. El.* 648 f., *Trach.* 910 f. τῆς παλαιᾶς (Housman, *C.R.* XXXIX. 78) οὐσίας.

³ Cf. e.g. *Eur. Ion* 1106 κλεινὴν (Reiske for κλεινὰι), γυναῖκες.

⁴ If it can be proved that there is no other possibility an emendation becomes a correction. Could ingenuity devise any alternative here?

Yes, one, but it is far inferior. Before getting μέγαν (the final clue) I did entertain, for hardly one hour, οὐ δόμοις ἐμαντής . . . μὴ μέγας στόλος κτλ. See *Eur. I.T.* 57 and imagery in context; and the *human* στόλος of a house has *feel*, *Agam.* 897-8. I have formulated the various objections, but surely nobody would require them.

⁵ Under κρηνίς, on the other hand, they give no reference, even *ex coni.*, to this play, where it very properly appears in the Oxford text (815).

he may fool away our revenue. Is Xerxes a man? Not he; he is a god, of course; but he is a colt.

Now for an interesting phenomenon. Lawson at 167 made a brilliant correction, but he did not know it; he put it forward tentatively; and no wonder, for he himself destroyed its strongest support. I should never have had the wit to think of *φωσιν* δ; but if I had, I should have had the sense to retain *ἀνάνδρων*. That exactitude of balance between the two phrases is as Greek as it could be. And it must take a great deal to invalidate the *prima facie* very Aeschylean phrase 'riches unmanned' or 'lordless'.¹ In accepting *φωσιν* with *ἀχρημάτοις* I do not overlook *φῶς* with *μέγαν δλβον* at *Cho.* 863-5. *Per contra*, I remember *μέγαν . . . φωτὸς δλβον* at *Agam.* 752. To contrast men with things, *φῶς* is the word used at *Agam.* 433. But what weighs with me most here is the consideration, What exactly *can* the meaning be of *φῶς οὐ λάμπει ὅσον σθένος πάρα*? Nothing whatever; it is a pure self-contradiction; and that it would have been so for Aeschylus would seem to be proved by *σθένουσα λαμπὰς κτλ.* *Agam.* 296, cf. *fr.* 386.² And on the other side, the idea will be that more summarily represented by the familiar antithesis between the *πλούσιος* and the *ἀσθενής*, *Eur. Suppl.* 433 f., and frequently elsewhere. For the real thought of 166-7 compare *Call. Hymn I*, 94-6, cited by Groeneboom.

To sum up. *κάμει φροντίς; ἔμαντῆς δλβον.*³ *χρυσεοστόλμους δόμους, τὸ*

¹ Dindorf, *Lex. s.v.*, explains *ἀνάνδρων* 'i.e. virorum domo absentium.' Not a bit; what sort of an army is it that has to be kept always at home? Each bride at 289 (*ἀνάνδρους*) laments her lord, not the whole army. The city is not *ἀνάνδρων* but *κίναϊδρων*, 119. The fact is, the trouble here has been complicated by a mistaken extension of the reference in *παρουσίαν* at 169; that is just a Greek redundancy (*δμ. δομ.=δεσπότης* when present; cf. *παρὼν phassim*), and does not represent Atossa's anxiety about Xerxes, which is for his success and not his presence, as 176-214 shows. *χρήματα* *χρήματ' ἀνὴρ* is the contrary sentiment.

² Besides, the syntax of the relative clause is ambiguous in codd. (supply *αὐτοῖς* or *αὐτῷ*?), with Lawson it has the given dative *ἀπὸ κοινοῦ*.

³ The point here is Athenian anti-Persian irony; the personal self-importance of the despotic House; cf. 214, a tonic line of the drama, most unhappily transformed by Lawson

Δαρείου τε κάμὸν; ἔμαντῆς μέγαν δλβον, δν Δαρεῖος ἤρεν. 161-4, men (two, mutually contrasted) and money; 166, money without men; 167, men without money; 168-9, money—but the man? This restoration is a synthesis, to be taken or left entire.

167-6. Ludwig's transposition,⁴ clearly right in logic and emphasis (cf. Wecklein's comm.), suffered in my view from two disadvantages: 'men' was more difficult to supply backwards than forwards; and *σέβειν* representing imperative, while certainly awkward in any case with the assertive *λάμπειν*, seemed impossible when separated by that from the conniving proximity of *μοι*. Lawson's unconscious removal of the first objection has driven me to assail the second. Many were the critics who had been rightly offended by *σέβειν* itself and by the pleonasm with *ἐν τιμῇ*, but of their substitutes otherwise helpful all are palaeographically incredible. Pindar *Ol.* ix, 88 *ἔσχεθε κύδος*. My *ἀν* alone I consider salutary; it gives Atossa's thought; 167 observation, 166 analogical inference.

674 ff.

There is good reason to think that Xerxes was described in similar language elsewhere in this poem.

At the unmetrical verse and untrue implication *Ar. Frogs* 1028, favour has deservedly been given to Tyrrell's *ἥνικ' ἐκώκυσας παῖ Δαρείου τεθνεώτος*. But Tyrrell himself in proposing this (*C.R.* I 130) capped it with *πόρι* in place of *παῖ* (codd. *περι*); on which Housman (*ibid.* 313) justly observed that 'the phrase plainly is one which a comic writer would hardly himself invent; and, if Aristophanes did employ it, the surmise would be natural that Aeschylus in the *Persae* had actually called Xerxes *πόρις Δαρείου*.' Housman thereupon proceeded to elicit this term from the passage with which I am now to deal, and which is given by M thus:—

ὃ πολὺκλαυτε φίλοισι θανών, 674
τὶ τάδε δυνάτα δυνάτα
περὶ τῷ σὲ δίδυμα διαγόνει ἀμάρτια

into a democratization of Persia! The ironic personality reaches an extreme at 845-51.

⁴ And look at the length of the homoeoarchon, ten letters; that shows what happened.

Vari
(bis)
seme
hand
H
of 6
Blon
675;
poss
poss
spain
mate
of a
prov
sense
a gre
is om

Here
inser
catin
tuall
εν.
κ = ι
(foll
thoug
desce
δίδυμ
inter
ouste
πόρ
girls
τις m
314.
are o
naval
conte
is a p
not in
ἀνεμ
lyrics
ἰαλεμ
the ve

¹ No
the too
I do n

PRO
deser
note
tradit
ff. and

Variants are the remarkable *δυνάστα* (bis) of codd. cett. for *δυνάτα* (*δυνάστα semel* Q) and a δ' inserted by the second hand before *ἀμάρτια*.¹

Housman's very tentative restoration of 676 proceeds from an amendment to Blomfield, who retained the text at 675; but an agonized cry of 'possible, possible' seems to me impossible, impossible. The passage is generally despaired of; yet I find here all the materials, only very slightly 'telescoped,' of a reading which, I would submit, provides both perfect metre and ideal sense. We require a verb, and that is a great help, for I am positive that there is only one way to get it.

ὦ πολύκλαυτε φίλοισι θανῶν δυνάστα,
τί τάδε δίδυμα δίδυμα
πόρτακι σὺ κάκ' ἱαλεμένθ' ὁμαρτεῖ;

Here the only letters which I have inserted (as opposed to a little duplicating) are *εμ*, and even those are virtually a duplication of the neighbouring *εν*. Nobody would be surprised (since *κ = ισ*) to hear that *πορταισισωισαι* (followed by *σια*) became *περιταισαι*; though perhaps, when *δυνάστα* had descended to overpower first the latter *δίδυμα* and then its fellow, a surviving interlinear or marginal *δίδυμα* itself ousted its substantival *κακά*.

πόρις and *πόρτις* are applied only to girls elsewhere, but Aeschylus has *πόρτις* masculine, of Epaphus, *Suppl.* 42, 314. The 'double double toil and trouble' are of course the disasters military and naval; the latter makes the following context, the former the preceding. It is a pity that the lovely word *ἱαλεμέεις* is not in the dictionary; but *στονόεις* (1053), *ἀνεμόεις*, *οἰδματόεις* etc. are in Aeschylean lyrics. This association of *πόρταξ* and *ἱαλεμέεις* appears to me absolutely in the vein of quaint ironic plangency which

gives its unique flavour to the lyric element in this dramatic poem. My 674 and 676 are metrically equivalent;² 675=680. I need hardly add that I think *πόρι* right in the Aristophanic allusion to the recovered 676. *δίδυμα κακά* I find only in Aeschylus, *Sept.* 782, cf. 849 f.

If anybody thinks that this is merely an 'e.g.' restoration, and that there must be other possibilities, may I recommend him to try? The field in which I found this calf is very circumscribed, and the several scents are strong.

628-632.

(A PROPOS OF C.R. XLVIII 55 F.)

ἀλλά, χθόνιοι δαίμονες ἄγνοί,
Γῇ τε καὶ Ἑρμῇ, βασιλεῦ τ' ἐτέρων,
πέμψατ' ἑνερθεν ψυχὴν ἐς φῶς·
εἰ γάρ τι κακῶν ἄκος οἶδε πλέον,
μόνος ἂν θνητῶν πέρας εἴποι.

Lawson's first paragraph strikes me as excellent both in argument and in illustration. I agree, too, with the first sentence of his third paragraph. And yet his remedies appear to me quite wrong, every one. But I will not argue much; here is my restoration to serve instead.

ἀλλά, χθόνιοι δαίμονες ἄγνοί,
Γῇ τε καὶ Ἑρμῇ, βασιλεῦ τ' ἐτέρων,
βασιλέως ἡμῶν
πέμψατ' ἑνερθεν ψυχὴν ἐς φῶς·
εἰ γάρ τι κακῶν ἄκος οἶδε, πόλει
μόνος ἂν θρήνων πέρας εἴποι.

The balance of royalties is Aeschylean; *Agam.* 114 οἰωνῶν βασιλεὺς βασιλεῦσι νεῶν; our play, 24, βασιλῆς βασιλέως ὑποχοι μέγαν; and cf. 151-2. *θνητός* cannot of course be applied to the dead; if citation were necessary, one could point to Eur. *H.F.* 491. *θρήνων* belongs to Gomperz; but in *οἶδε, πόλει* for *οἶδε πλέον* I do not seem to have been anticipated.

A. Y. CAMPBELL.

University of Liverpool.

¹ Not δ', apparently; see Wilamowitz. With the too obvious but helpless emendation *διόγοιεν* I do not reckon.

² Dindorf had already, I find, placed *δυνάστα* after *θανῶν*, but he quite needlessly removed *φίλοισι*.

A NOTE ON PLATO'S ASTRONOMY.

PROFESSOR SHOREY, whose views deserve careful attention, writes in a note on *Rep.* 530b 'The alleged contradiction between this and *Laws* 821a ff. and *Tim.* 47a is due to a misappre-

hension. That the stars in their movements do not perfectly express the exactness of mathematical conceptions is no more than modern astronomers say. In the *Laws* passage Plato pro-

tests against the idea that there is no law and order governing the movement of the planets, but that they are "wandering stars," as irregular in their movements as they seem. . . . There is not the slightest contradiction or change of opinion in the three passages if interpreted rightly in their entire context.'

I respectfully submit that the 'unity of Plato's thought' is here understood in a way counter to both external and internal evidence.

(1) External evidence. There is, of course, nothing in the *Timaeus* or the *Laws* to contradict the particular statement of the *Republic* at 530b that the planetary motions, whatever they may be, are *regular*. But there is external evidence, not mentioned by Shorey, that Plato's view on the question *what* these motions are underwent a real change. There is (a) the well-known statement of Theophrastus preserved by Plutarch (*Quaest. Platon.* 1006c) that Plato, *πρεσβύτερος γενόμενος*, 'repented of having placed the earth at the centre.' This express testimony is far too important to be lightly passed over in silence. There is also (b) the notorious fact that whereas the *Phaedo* by express words (108d-109a) and the Myth of Er by implication presuppose an earth stationary 'at the centre,' Aristotle (*de Caelo* 293b 30) definitely understood the *Timaeus* to represent the earth as 'at the centre, but *moving*.' Aristotle's evidence also should not be merely silently disregarded. He may conceivably simply have misunderstood the *Timaeus*, but the thing is so unlikely that we are at least put upon a further careful investigation of Plato's words before we pronounce.

(2) Internal evidence. To begin with the passage from the *Laws*.¹ Here the

speaker is calling attention to a doctrine which he says he has only learned recently and in advanced age (*οὔτε νέος οὔτε πάλαι ἀκηκόως*, 821c). In explaining the character of this novel *μάθημα*, he first says that it is false to assert of the sun or any planet *ὡς ἄρα πλανᾶται ποτε*. Had he stopped there, Shorey's account of his meaning would be correct; the sense would be only that a planet has a definite orbit of some sort, as the *Republic* says, and we should merely wonder why *this* should be represented as a novel idea. But he adds words which, unless we ignore their plain grammatical sense, mean something much more, and something of which the *Republic* gives us no hint, *τὴν αὐτὴν γὰρ αὐτῶν ὁδὸν ἕκαστον καὶ οὐ πολλὰς ἀλλὰ μίαν αἰὲ κύκλῳ διεξέρχεται, φαίνεται δὲ πολλὰς φερόμενον*. With Shorey's interpretation these words would add nothing to the foregoing denial that the planet really *πλανᾶται*, and we have to explain their presence by that tendency to verbiage which is not uncommon in Plato's latest work. But by doing so we wilfully ignore the known meaning of the phrase *πολλὰς ὁδοὺς* (or *φορὰς*) *ἀερεσθαι*. The phrase does not mean 'to move irregularly, now this way, now that,' but something very different, 'to move with several motions *at once*,' to have a *composite* movement. Two parallels from Aristotle will sufficiently establish the point, though they are far from standing alone: *de Caelo* 286a 34, *πάντα τὰ φερόμενα τὴν φορὰν τὴν ἐγκύκλιον ὑπολείπομενα φαίνεται καὶ κινούμενα πλείους μίας φορᾶς ἔξω τῆς πρώτης σφαίρας*; i.e. we see that all the planets 'fall behind' the diurnal movement of the *ἀπλανές*, and must therefore infer that each of them has at least two *simultaneous* motions, one in the same sense as the *πρώτη σφαῖρα*, and one in the contrary sense; *Met.* 1073b 3, *τὸ δὲ πλῆθος ἤδη τῶν φορῶν ἐκ τῆς οἰκειοτάτης φιλοσοφίας τῶν μαθηματικῶν ἐπιστημῶν δεῖ σκοπεῖν, ἐκ τῆς ἀστρολογίας . . . ὅτι μὲν οὖν πλείους τῶν φερομένων αἱ φοραὶ φανερόν τοις καὶ μετρίως ἡμένοις· πλείους γὰρ ἕκαστον φέρεται μίας τῶν πλανωμένων ἀστρῶν*; i.e. it is manifest that each planet has more motions than one, in the sense that its movement is

¹ Professor Shorey's references have been either misprinted or unfortunately chosen. The really pertinent references, as what follows will show, are *Laws* 822a 6-8, *Timaeus* 40b 8-c 2. Whether the two later dialogues are in accord with the *Republic* depends entirely on the questions (1) what is meant in the former place by *τὴν αὐτὴν . . . ὁδὸν . . . καὶ οὐ πολλὰς ἀλλὰ μίαν αἰὲ*, (2) and how we read and translate in the second the words *διλομένην δὲ τὴν περὶ τὸν διὰ παντὸς πόλον τεταμένην*. To say that Plato had always held that a planet has really a regular orbit is merely irrelevant.

a resultant of several components. The verbal correspondence ought to show that Aristotle here has in mind, and means to contradict, the words of *Laws* 822a (and probably also those of *Epinomis* 987b 8, since his τοῖς καὶ μετρίως ἡμμένοις looks like a conscious retort to the ὀλίγα τούτων εἰδόσιν of that dialogue).¹

It should be clear then that in the *Laws* Plato means to deny precisely what Aristotle asserted, that the orbit of a planet is composite. To escape this conclusion we must wilfully ignore the real meaning of πλείους ὁδούς φέρεσθαι in the interests of a preconceived theory that the 'unity' of Plato's thought is exclusive of the possibility of self-correction, and do this in the face of the express statement of the Athenian in the *Laws* that his doctrine is one which he had not held when a younger man. Thus what the *Laws* denies is exactly what was implied by the *Republic* in the Myth of Er, where the composite σφόνδυλος of Necessity was described as revolving as a whole in one sense, while each of its inner rings is separately revolving in the counter sense (617a). That is, Plato ends by deliberately eliminating what he had taken in the *Republic* to be one component of every planetary orbit, the 'diurnal' revolution on the poles of the ἀπλανές. Though he does not explain himself further, it is clear that the elimination implies that this apparent diurnal motion of the heavenly bodies is really a diurnal motion of the earth. Hence the statement of Theophrastus about a change of view on the part of the 'ageing' Plato is entirely borne out by the Platonic texts. One may add a further point. It is certain from the *Epinomis*, which must at least be taken to represent the astronomy of the Academy at the end of Plato's life, that in denying the composite character of the planetary orbits Plato did not mean to deny that a planet's 'proper motion'

is in the sense contrary to the 'diurnal revolution'; he was not proposing to revert to the crude view that the planets move through the Eclyptic 'with the sun' from east to west. The doctrine that their 'proper movement' is in the reverse sense is presupposed as part of the current theory attacked in the *Laws*, and it is not this feature of that doctrine which is being denied. The novelty of the astronomy of the *Laws* does not consist in asserting that the proper motion of a planet is in the sense contrary to the 'diurnal revolution,' but in denying that the 'diurnal revolution' itself is a component of the planet's orbit. There is thus no reason to imagine that the contrariety of sense between the orbit of a planet and the 'diurnal revolution' was a discovery of Plato. On the contrary, the very fact that it is taken for granted in the Myth of Er, as one part of an astronomical theory which the *Laws* corrects, rather suggests that the discovery itself is much older than Plato, and so far bears out the statement of the *I lacita* that it was already known to Alcmaeon. What is it, then, which has happened between the composition of the *Republic* and that of the *Laws* to lead Plato to such marked dissatisfaction with the other part of the astronomical theory of the Myth of Er, the doctrine that the 'diurnal revolution' is one component of a planet's orbit? We can, of course, only make conjectures, but I suggest that what has happened is the enunciation of the famous astronomical theory of Eudoxus. What that theory shows is that if we start in our astronomy with an earth 'at rest in the centre,' it is not enough to resolve the apparent path of a planet into two components, the 'diurnal revolution' and a proper motion in the counter sense; every orbit must have at least three components, and some of them at least four. The very complexity of this scheme might well suggest the advantages of a simpler view which would eliminate at least some of the complications by transferring the apparent motions of a planet to our observation-post, the earth. It is true that the chronology of the life of Eudoxus cannot be worked out with certainty, but when we combine the notices of

¹ Compare the way in which Simplicius (on *de Caelo* 292b 24) opens his account of the Eudoxian theory, οὕτω μὲν οὖν τὴν λύσιν ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης τῆς ἀπορίας ἀποδέδωκεν, ἐνδοὺς τῇ ἀληθείᾳ καὶ συγχωρήσας τοὺς πλάνητας πολλὰς κινεῖσθαι κινῆσεις τῷ εἶδει. It is precisely this which the *Laws* denies *totidem verbis*.

him preserved in Diogenes Laertius with the information preserved by Simplicius that his scheme of the concentric spheres was offered as a solution of a problem propounded by Plato to the Academy, it will, I believe, be found that it is impossible to date the production of his theory before the composition of the *Republic* without bringing the *Republic* itself down to an impossibly late period in Plato's career. This is what suggests to me the *probability* that in the passage of the *Laws* (and in the astronomical passage of *Epinomis* 987, if it is genuine) we have Plato's reasons for not accepting the Eudoxian scheme. I do not, of course, suggest that Plato had necessarily any rival scheme of his own to propound, only that he rightly felt that in starting with a stationary earth 'at the centre' Eudoxus was beginning wrong in principle.

It is another and less important question whether the single sentence of the *Timaeus* about the earth (41b-c) is consistent with either *Republic* or *Laws*. (Shorey's reference to *Tim.* 47a is, in any case, not to the point: what is said there contains no astronomical details and might have been written by Plato at any time; the passage in which discrepancy with the *Republic* has been found, and from which Shorey, to establish his thesis, ought to remove it, is *Tim.* 41b-c, which he ignores.) I have discussed the meaning and text of *Tim.* 41b-c at such length in my commentary on the dialogue that I may be content to be very brief here. The general account of the planets in the dialogue has assumed that their orbits are compounded of a revolution along with the *ἀπλανές* and a further proper motion in the 'Circle of the Other' (39a). This is so far consistent with the Myth of Er, but, as I think I have shown, flatly at variance with the *Laws*. But the *Timaeus* also (47b-c) attributes a motion of some kind to the 'central' earth, as was quite properly asserted by Aristotle, and is repeated after him in Diogenes Laertius III 75. This move-

ment of the earth, in view of what we have already been told about the planetary orbits, cannot be the 'diurnal revolution,' and nothing is said of the length of its period. We need not even suppose that *Timaeus* is imagined to have any more definite view than that the earth moves somehow 'to and fro,' and that this complicates the appearances in the heavens. It must therefore remain uncertain whether the scheme of Eudoxus was already known to Plato when he wrote the *Timaeus*. If it was not, my conjecture that it may have been the very complexity of this scheme which led Plato to prefer a moving earth will fall to the ground. Whether the *Timaeus* as a whole can be squared with the *Republic* then turns on the question whether, when Plato wrote the *Republic*, he was already prepared to admit that the earth, though 'at the centre,' has some sort of motion, and merely disregarded this motion in the Myth of Er as negligible for the purposes of his picture. I hardly think the supposition will commend itself to anyone not haunted by the prepossession that it is derogatory to Plato to believe that he would ever modify any of his opinions. But it is not a demonstrably impossible supposition. What is fairly demonstrable is that in *Laws* 822a, 'rightly interpreted,' the earth is not only moving, but 'out of the centre,' as Theophrastus said, a planet among others.¹

A. E. TAYLOR.

University of Edinburgh.

¹ Let me point out an unfortunate oversight in Shorey's note on *Rep.* 617a. Burnet is quoted for the view that the orbital revolution of the planets in a sense counter to that of the 'diurnal rotation' was unknown to the Pythagoreans and is probably a discovery of Plato. The quotation comes from the second edition of *Early Greek Philosophy*, p. 123, and Shorey forgot that in the third edition (p. 110) Burnet expressly withdrew his statement, and said that the doctrine may be ascribed 'probably to Pythagoras himself,' and is in any case pre-Platonic. The circumstances in which Shorey's volume was compiled make the error very excusable, but it should not go uncorrected.

pars
arvin
[My
Master,
derry, s
notice
interpre
tion is,
to comp
to one
mary o

THE
these
transl
their
spear-
grind
again,
tion (i
ous la
etc.'

In
the c
winte
would
arvin
again
sonia,
distur
war-c
arma
weap
urely
and s
been
the fa
off its
the w
then,
spear
winte
make
the s

IN
mass
Thuc
dispo
αὐτοῦ
νέτο,
ἀπὸ γ
Th
by an

NOTE ON VIRGIL, AEN. VII. 626 F.

pars levis clipeos et spicula lucida tergent
arvina pingui subiguntque in cote securis.

[My predecessor, the late Professor MacMaster, D.Lit., of Magee College, Londonderry, shortly before his death brought to my notice what seems to me to be an original interpretation of these lines. As his interpretation is, I think, clearly correct, I have ventured to compose this note, relying mainly on a letter to one of his friends in which he gave a summary of his view.]

THE traditional interpretation of these lines may be seen in Mackail's translation (1885): 'And now they rub their shields smooth and make their spear-heads glitter with fat lard, and grind their axes on the whetstone.' Or again, Jackson, in the Oxford Translation (1908), renders: 'Part, with unctuous lard, burnished their smooth shields etc.'

In olden time in Italy as in Greece the campaigning season ended when winter set in. The thrifty yeoman would smear shield and spear with *arvina pinguis* before laying them up against the next time of trouble. Ausonia, we are told, had long been undisturbed; but now that the foul fiend's war-cry was heard, all, in hot haste, *arma requirunt*—rush to find their weapons. There was no time for leisurely *furbishing* or *polishing* of shield and spear. The axe, naturally, had not been smeared: work in the home or on the farm had kept it bright, but taken off its edge; so it must be ground on the whetstone. The *arvina pinguis* had, then, been smeared over shield and spear when they were laid by for the winter, and now it was wiped off to make them shining once more. Just in the same way the golf caddy 'shines'

your irons when your season of play comes round again by removing the oil which had been applied to save the clubs from rust. Dismiss, then, *furbish* and *polish* and like meanings for *tergere* as possibly suitable elsewhere and translate here thus: 'wipe their bucklers smooth'—clots of dirty grease had gathered through long desuetude—'their spear-blades bright, (cleansing them) from fat grease;' *arvina* was most likely some preparation made from either *adeps* or *sebum*, and much grimy dust would have gathered on it.

The main difficulty in this interpretation is to be found in the ablative *arvina pingui*. This would seem to be an unparalleled use of the ablative of separation with *tergere*. Virgil uses *tergere* only twice: in the *Moretum* v. 109, 'manu summa lacrimantia lumina terget'—a use of the ablative with *tergere* found once and again in other authors; and again he uses *tergere* in this passage towards the end of his life. As Dr. Mackail points out in his Introduction (p. lxxxiv) to his Commentary on Virgil, Virgil's 'Latin is a language of his own, and one on which he was up to the last perpetually experimenting.' Was he not here experimenting in using *tergere* with an ablative of separation on the analogy of similar ablatives with *purgare*? (For *exx.* v. L. and S. s.v.) Phaedrus i. 22. 3 (quoted by L. and S.) *domum muribus purgare* is an excellent analogy. It would be interesting to know if any other examples of this use of *tergere* can be brought forward.

T. FINNEGAN.

Magee College, Londonderry.

THUCYDIDES IV. 48. 4.

In this passage, after describing the massacre of the oligarchs at Corcyra, Thucydides tells how the democrats disposed of their bodies. He says, καὶ αὐτοὺς οἱ Κερκυραῖοι, ἐπειδὴ ἡμέρα ἐγένετο, φορηδὸν ἐπὶ ἀμάξας ἐπιβαλόντες ἀπήγαγον ἔξω τῆς πόλεως.

The word *φορηδόν* is not questioned by any editor; its meaning is taken to

be 'like matting' (*φορός*, basket, mat), i.e. one row lengthwise, another across (that this really is the meaning seems probable from the use of the word in Thucydides II. 75); but no good reason for such a curious arrangement is given.

I would like to suggest that Thucydides wrote *φορηδόν*, 'like a bundle' (*φορέω*, *φόρημα*), in which case *φορηδόν*

ἐπὶ ἀμάξας ἐπιβαλόντες will mean something like our 'bundling them into carts.' The word is rare, it is true; but so is φορμηδόν. φορηδόν occurs in Lucian, *Timon*, 21 (and nowhere else as far as I can find), where Plutus says to Hermes, ἐς δέλτον ἐμβαλόντες με καὶ κατασημηνάμενοι ἐπιμελῶς, φορηδόν ἀράμενοι μετακομίζουσι. The allusion is to the transference of property by will, in which wealth is 'parcelled up' into an easily handled form.

φορμηδόν is used by Thucydides in II. 75 to describe the lateral support provided for the mound raised by the Peloponnesians against the wall of Plataea—ξύλα μὲν οὖν τέμνοντες ἐκ τοῦ Κιθαιρώναος παρικοδόμου ἐκατέρωθεν, φορμηδόν ἀντὶ τοίχων τιθέντες, ὅπως μὴ διαχέοιτο ἐπὶ πολὺ τὸ χῶμα. Here the crosswise arrangement of the planks is natural and effective. But a similar arrangement of the corpses at Corcyra is pointless. One would naturally expect them to be handled carelessly; if

a careful arrangement were used, its only point would be economy of space. This would best be got by placing the dead all parallel, each row fitting into the interstices of the row below. Sardines are not packed φορμηδόν.

The passage is quoted by Aristides, 2. 312, in his speech *For the Four*—οὐδὲν δεῖ κατ' ὄνομα ἐξετάζειν, ἀλλὰ φορμηδόν ἐφ' ἀμαξῶν ἐκφέρειν, ὥσπερ τοὺς Κερκυραίων νεκρούς. He is speaking of certain philosophers, and saying that they can be lumped together and quickly disposed of. If the word φορμηδόν in Thucydides is pointless, in this context it is grotesque; φορηδόν on the other hand is quite appropriate.

I suggest that Thucydides wrote φορηδόν, and Aristides quoted φορηδόν, and that φορμηδόν was introduced by someone with Thucydides II. 75 in mind, and afterwards incorporated in Aristides too.

R. E. WYCHERLEY.

University of Manchester.

NOTE ON EPICURUS (*GNOMOLOGIUM VATICANUM*, No. LXXXI).

THE last line of the Epicurus aphorisms preserved in Vaticanus 1950 offers a difficulty yet to be solved. In Bailey's *Epicurus* we read the sentence LXXXI: Οὐ λυίει τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς παραχὴν οὐδὲ τὴν ἀξιόλογον ἀπογεννᾶ χαρὰν οὔτε πλοῦτος ὑπάρχων ὁ μέγιστος οὐδ' ἢ παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς τιμὴ καὶ περίβλεψις οὔτ' ἄλλο τι τῶν παρὰ τὰς ἀδιόριστους αἰτίας, with the translation, 'The disturbance of the soul cannot be ended nor true joy created either by the possession of the greatest wealth or by honour and respect in the eyes of the mob or by anything else that is associated with causes of unlimited desire,' and on it the commentary 'τῶν παρὰ τὰς ἀδιόριστους αἰτίας, lit. "things connected with unlimited causes," i.e. causes of unlimited desire, such as there is for wealth, honour, power etc. Bignone takes it to mean "causes not proportional to the natural end," but this seems less natural.' The fact is, neither Bailey's nor Bignone's explanation is particularly natural, and for that reason neither is absolutely convincing. But the very term to which the scruple

adheres is not read at all in the old manuscript. There is written, as Wotke states, ἀξυρίστους, and I can verify it, except that the first two accents are probably the ordinary dots used in minuscule manuscripts above υ and ι (ξυρί). ἀδιόριστους, by Bailey put into the text, is merely a conjecture of Usener. The adjective, now in the Vat. nearly illegible, was already in the archetype rather difficult to decipher, because the end of the fragment was damaged. There is no doubt about it. The original word had surely undergone more than one injury through confusion of similar letters. The problem now is, to hit upon a word palaeographically similar to that monster. It appears to me that the blurred vestiges hint at ἀξυστάτους (or ἀουσστάτους). On the one hand ζ and ξ, on the other hand σι and α are almost identical; likewise ρι and στ somewhat resemble one another. I admit such palaeographical bagatelles are not conclusive. But decisive is the fact that the proposed reading gives an absolutely clear sense. For it means 'not

solidified, unstable', the same as *ἀβέβαιος*, which, associated likewise with the noun *αἰρία*, meets us in *Ep.* III. § 134 οὐρε *ἀβέβαιον αἰρίαν*, decidedly a very close parallel. In this way we find again a favourite idea of our philosopher: wealth, honour, respect etc. appertain to those 'unstable causes' which can never dissolve the disturbance of the soul. Compare also what Lucretius III 66, V 1120, following his master, proclaims about the foundation of the '*stabilis vita*.' I may just observe in passing that *ἀσύστατος* and cognate locutions are of repeated occurrence in the Epicurean books. We find the very word *ἀσύστατος* in the frag. 254 U (from Plut.

adv. Col. 1123b). Compare further frag. 73 B=480 U; *Rat. Sent.* XXXIX; *Epist.* I 48; *Epist.* II 99, 107; Diog. Laert. X 120=frag. 540=*Vita Epic.* 120b; frag. 492 U, where Alfred Körte (Metrodori frag. Col. VI N frag. 74) luckily restored *συστάντος*. A. Vogliano (*Epicuri et Epicureorum scripta in Herculi papyris servata*) brought to light the new word *συστατεῖν* in the frag. de nat. 5, III 1 οὐ <σ>υστατο<ν>υτι πρὸς αὐτά. Nevertheless I confess that in these examples the words *συνίστασθαι* and *σύστασις* are used in a somewhat different sense.

KONSTANTIN HORNA.

Vienna.

TAM MAGNUS.

Tam magnus is for the schoolboy an illicit expression, though the grammarians are shy of condemning it. Genuine instances in the speeches and dialogues of Cicero are extremely few. In *Verr.* II, v, 26 affords a sure instance:—urbem Syracusas elegerat, cuius hic situs atque haec natura esse loci caelique dicitur, ut nullus umquam dies *tam magna* ac turbulenta tempestate fuerit quin aliquo tempore eius diei solem homines viderint. Clearly here the adverb *tam* is required to qualify the second adjective no less than *magna*. In *Verr.* II, iii, 111 is less certain:—Quid, si doceo, iudices, eos qui cccc mod. lucri faciunt damnum facturos fuisse, si tua iniquitas, si tui ex cohorte recuperatores non intercederent, num quis poterit in tanto lucro tantaque iniquitate dubitare quin propter improbitatem tuam *tam magnos* quaestus feceris, propter magnitudinem quaestus improbus esse volueris (tuam *tam Lamb.* tuam *O tam p. celt.*). The parallelism of the two clauses introduced by *quin* is not furthered by reading in the first *tuam tam*, nor is it easy to accept *tam magnos* following hard on *tanto . . . tantaque*. *Tam magnus* was unnecessarily introduced by Halm at *Philipp.* II, 7:—At ego, tamquam mihi cum Crasso contentio esset, quocum multae et magnae fuerunt etc. (et iam *V* et *tam Halm*).

The equal merit of *tantus* would appear undeniable in *Tusc. Disp.* I, xlii, 100:—O virum Sparta dignum! ut mihi quidem, qui *tam magno* animo fuerit, innocens damnatus esse videatur. Merguet refers to a disputed sentence at the beginning of *De Legg.* II, 10 (23). Some older editors—e.g. Moser and Creuzer, Bake—read:

Conclusa quidem est a te *tam magna* lex sane quam brevi; but, though the readings vary, *tam* is not supported by either the first or the second hand of A B H, and can confidently be rejected.

No example of *tam magnus* is cited from Caesar. But one occurs in *De bello Africo*, 58:—cum (adversarii) *tam magnis* copiis auxiliisque regis essent praediti promptiusque prosilissent ante, secum concursuros propiusque accessuros. There is no v.l. here.

W. A. LAIDLAW.

University of St. Andrews.

SENECA, *Ep.* 47, 9.

Stare ante limen Callisti dominum suum vidi et eum qui illi impegerat titulum, qui inter ridicula mancipia produxerat, aliis intrantibus excludi.

ridicula *codd.* (Haase, Summers): *reicula Muretus* (edd. plerique).

THE case for *reicula*, already strong, is clinched by the following passage of Galen (*Protr.* c. 6):—Καίτοι <γ> οὐκ ἀσχερὸν τὸν οἰκέτην μὲν ἐνίοτε δραχμῶν εἶναι μυρίων ἄξιον, αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν δεσπότην αὐτοῦ μηδὲ μᾶς; καὶ τί λέγω μᾶς; οὐδ' ἂν προῖκά τις τὸν τοιοῦτον λάβοι. μήποθ' ἐαυτοὺς μόνους ἡτιμάσκειν ἐκ πάντων μηδεμίαν ἐκμαθόντες τέχνην; δταν γὰρ καὶ τὰ ἄλογα τῶν ζώων ἐν τεχνικοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασι παιδεύωσι καὶ οἰκέτην ἀργὸν καὶ ἀτεχνον οὐδενὸς ἄξιον νομίζωσι, ἐπιμελῶνται δὲ καὶ τῶν χωρίων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων κτημάτων ὅπως ἑκαστος εἰς δύναμιν ὅτι βέλτιστον ἦ, μόνων δ' ἐαυτῶν ἀμελῶσι, μηδ' εἰ ψυχὴν ἔχουσι γινώσκοντες, εὐθελος ὅτι τοῖς ἀποβλήτοις τῶν οἰκετῶν τοῖσιν.

W. L. LORIMER.

University of St. Andrews.

REVIEWS

THE GEOGRAPHY OF HOMER.

R. HENNIG: *Die Geographie des homerischen Epos*. Pp. vi+102. (Neue Wege zur Antike I. 10.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1934. Paper, RM. 4.80.

THIS short essay raises important questions of method and interpretation, and offers fresh identifications of localities described in the *Odyssey*. Prehistoric archaeology has revolutionized our outlook on Homer, by its perspective of early cultures in the Mediterranean world, and in continental Europe as well. Though Strabo believed that the author of the *Odyssey* had this earlier and wider knowledge, modern critics have interpreted Homer in terms of the 'classical' geography of Aeschylus and Herodotus, and regarded the westward adventures of Odysseus as echoes of Milesian exploration in Pontus. Hence forced interpretations, and sheer mis-translation of some passages.

Dr. Hennig contends that the *Odyssey* needs only to be translated accurately, to interpret itself geographically. If, for example, ὠκεανός had προχοαί, ἀψόρροος cannot mean that it flowed ever into itself (*Od.* 20. 65); and a 'naïve' poet like Homer does not state absurdities. Another tidal phenomenon, the slack-water at the προχοή of the Phaeacian river (*Od.* 5. 451-3) suggests that Phaeacia lay beyond the Straits: Dr. Hennig identifies it with Tartessus, whence 'eighteen days' by raft on the given course identify Ogygia with Madeira.

Other happy re-translations make sense of the Cimmerian climate and the Laestrygonian herdsman. Of Cimmeria, the Scholiast paraphrased rightly ἡέρι καὶ νεφέλῃ: it was foggy but not dark. In Laestrygonia, as it was the cowherd who hailed the shepherd at dawn and eve, the widespread custom of pasturing cattle by day, and sheep by night, is sufficient explanation how the 'sleepless man' could work double-shift.

With the fountain Ἀρτακίη Dr. Hennig turns the tables on the Pontic school of Homeric geography by demonstrating the Hellenic practice of giving Homeric place-names to suitable sites and landmarks—is there not an Ithaca in U.S.A.?—and this leads straight to his own identification of Ithaca, not with modern Thiaki or with Leucas, but with Corfu.

Ingenious, however, as Dr. Hennig's geographical interpretations are in detail, he has not faced the general problem of Odysseus' track which they raise. If, as he contends, Scylla and Charybdis belong to the Straits, and the Cimmerian country is a coast of western Europe, how does Odysseus reach Cimmeria, and return from it, without encountering them? And if Ogygia and Phaeacia lay outside the Straits, how did even a ship 'quicker than thought' slip through to Ithaca? *Dormitat Homerus*—or Hennig?

J. L. MYRES.

New College, Oxford.

HESIOD.

INEZ SELLSCHOPP: *Stilistische Untersuchungen zu Hesiod*. Pp. 125. Hamburg (printed by O. Schneider of Mainz), 1934. Paper.

THE priority in time of Homer to Hesiod was not assumed in antiquity nor any dependence of one on the other. Homer was the poet of epic narrative; Hesiod, whose narrative parts are not quoted by Plato, was the poet of (1) sayings, (2) practical agricultural instruction,

(3) catalogue stuff. Hesiodic meant something quite different from Homeric, and the Alexandrian critics used the two words as distinguishing labels. Does this essential difference mean merely the already noted distinction between epic narrative on the one hand and didactic and catalogue verse on the other, or does the difference go deeper; and is not Hesiod's independence of Homer and the epic tradition much greater

than is generally supposed? These are the questions which the authoress attempts to answer in this book. The work of previous writers who came to the conclusion that Hesiod's vocabulary is almost entirely Homeric, except when he is speaking of things not mentioned in Homer, she finds quite inadequate. Vocabulary alone is an insufficient guide; it is necessary to examine particularly the way in which Hesiod departs from the Homeric expressions and epithets, and generally how he adapted the Homeric *Kunstsprache* to meet the needs of his more philosophical and didactic verse. For example, the repetition of lines and half-lines, so characteristic of the epic technique, is almost entirely absent in Hesiod. Of course there are many epic formulae and epithets in Hesiod, but the authoress gives us interesting examples of the way in which Hesiod often slightly alters the traditional formula to suit his own context. Hesiod in short was the first Greek poet to stand on his own feet

and break away from a formulaic tradition of language which was inadequate for the expression of his thought. This conclusion is unquestionably right, but in order to reach it the writer of this book has introduced a great deal of irrelevant and sometimes erroneous argument which does not prove anything at all. It matters little that she follows Wilamowitz in excluding the *Days* from the *Works and Days*; but it matters a great deal that in discussing those lines in Hesiod which are the same or nearly the same as lines in Homer, when the Homeric line happens to occur in what she has learned from Wilamowitz to call the late parts of the *Odyssey*, then she suspects the imitation of being in the other direction and attempts to prove that the line is more appropriate and therefore original in Hesiod. This sort of thing both encumbers and vitiates an otherwise excellent piece of work.

T. A. SINCLAIR.

Queen's University, Belfast.

TWO BOOKS ON GREEK POETRY.

G. PERROTTA: *Saffo e Pindaro*. Pp. vii + 236. Bari: Laterza, 1935. Paper, L. 16.

O. FALTER: *Der Dichter und sein Gott bei den Griechen und Römern*. Pp. 95. Würzburg: Triltsch, 1934. Paper, RM. 3.

GOOD critics of Greek poetry are rare, and Perrotta's book is a pleasure to read. He has a good knowledge of Greek, a real taste for poetry, and an acquaintance with several European languages. He wears his learning lightly but wears it well. His comments, based on a careful study of the text, are much better than the average comments on Sappho. He covers many sides of her work and has something good to say on almost every one of them. He strikes the mean by thinking, surely with reason, that Didymus and Welcker were equally wrong in their judgments of Sappho and that what is wanted is not an account of Sappho's morals, of which nothing is known, but an estimate of her poetry, which is what really concerns us. On

these principles he constructs an excellent account of Sappho's poetry and gives a good general picture of her life. If he champions the authenticity of β 2 and does not adequately consider the difficulties, on other disputed points, such as his account of ϵ 3 or his conviction that Sappho really had a child called Cleis, common sense and tradition are on his side. At times he somewhat strains his evidence. In the extant remains of ϵ 3 there are few traces of chiding, and there is much to be said against the genuineness of the alleged line which is said to begin a fifth stanza in $\phi\alpha\lambda\upsilon\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \mu\omicron\iota$. Nor is it true, despite recent editions, that at ϵ 3, 10 the Berlin papyrus gives $\iota\sigma\alpha\iota$. Anyone who troubles to look at the papyrus will see that Schubart was right in printing $\iota\epsilon\alpha\iota$ and that his $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\alpha\iota$ is at least a possible reading. But these are matters of detail. Perrotta's strength is his sanity of outlook and sense of poetry. His work is at its best when he compares Sappho's love-poems with those of other Greek writers or briefly sketches the

different views which have been held of her in ancient and modern times. His enthusiasm is fortified with apt quotations and good arguments, and English readers should find pleasure not only in his excellent excerpts from English poets but in his praise of 'il solido realismo inglese' of a distinguished Oxford scholar.

The essay on Pindar is longer than that on Sappho, but leaves the impression that Perrotta finds him less sympathetic than her. After an interesting sketch of Pindar's reputation through the ages, Perrotta attacks the vexed question of the principles on which the odes are constructed. He gives useful summaries of various opinions, but his own conclusion is more critical than creative. He finds no difficulty in disposing of those who believe in logical or aesthetic unity, but he has nothing to put in their place, and his difficulty suggests that perhaps the whole question is an attempt to judge Pindar by pseudo-Aristotelian standards which were not known to the fifth century. Of more interest is the discussion of Pindar's

view of life, a subject on which Perrotta has not much new to say but says much that is true and interesting.

Falter's book is a very different affair. It is an attempt to collect the passages in which Greek and Latin poets speak of the different powers which they regarded as responsible for their inspiration. Their manners of invocation, their treatment of the Muses, their relations with their special gods, are duly classified and catalogued. The result is a useful if not very readable book. Falter does not explain what the poets really meant by the Muse and he makes no attempt to illuminate their experience of the creative process by modern parallels. Nor are his catalogues complete. In his section on 'Die Visionen und heiligen Träume der Dichter' he says nothing about Sappho's vision of Aphrodite or Pindar's vision of Alcmaeon, although these are the only two cases in early poetry where the poet actually describes a personal experience of this kind.

C. M. BOWRA.

Wadham College, Oxford.

THE MUSIC OF PINDAR'S 'GOLDEN LYRE.'

P. FRIEDLÄNDER: *Die Melodie zu Pindars erstem pythischen Gedicht*. Pp. 54. (Berichte über die Verh. d. Sächs. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Kl., 86. Band, 4. Heft; 1934). Leipzig: Hirzel, 1934. Paper, RM. 2.

THE authenticity of the music to the greater part of the first strophe of Pythian I, published by Athanasius Kircher in 1650, has long been doubted; partly because Kircher's alleged MS has never been found, partly because of certain suspicious features in the fragment itself, and partly because Kircher is known to have been guilty of falsifications in other scholarly matters. Recently, in *Les Etudes Classiques* I (1932), A. Rome has shown that the Pindaric text printed by Kircher was copied from the edition of Erasmus Schmid (1616), and that Kircher's fragment ends just where a page ends in Schmid's edition. Friedländer's pamphlet defends Kircher. The author skilfully provides an explanation, of a more

or less convincing kind, for each of the arguments previously brought against Kircher; but he does not seem quite to appreciate the fact that the strength of the case against Kircher lies not only in the individual suspicions but in their combination; and if this series of separate explanations were all that Friedländer had to offer, I should hold that his defence failed. The most important and novel part of his book, however, is a detailed examination of the melody itself and its relation to the text. He points out that the general melodic line is a descending one, that the first note of each *κῶλον* is higher in pitch than the last note of the preceding *κῶλον*, that when the melody rises it does so at a semantically important word, and that the musical phrases generally effect a caesura and not a diaeresis. On the basis of these observations, he argues that the melody was designed in relation to the text, and that since such a design was outside

the r
ship
the n
opini
Fried
there
or at
attrib
obsen
in th
are n
the ra
lände

ANT.
pri
Fro
Fa
Ko
Br
55.

THIS
atten
by th
die s
limin
book
which
in G
super
gener
plays
metri
porta
which
is alm
count

The
the s
proac
the p
dence
their
word
sense
which
and e
the A
lean).
almos
(in w
gaöde
exten

the range of one whose Greek scholarship was as poor as that of Kircher, the melody must be genuine. In my opinion the argument fails, because Friedländer does not convince me that there is any sort of design in the melody, or at least any which could not be attributed to Kircher. Some of the observations are only generalizations, in the formulation of which exceptions are neglected; others will scarcely bear the rather fanciful interpretations Friedländer places upon them. Without a

facsimile of Kircher's text and music it is impossible to demonstrate fully to the reader what I regard as the weaknesses of Friedländer's position; but I hope to have the opportunity elsewhere of surveying the whole problem. For the present, it must suffice for me to say that, much as I admire the ingenuity and learning to be found in the pamphlet, it does not persuade me that Kircher's melody is more than a forgery.

J. F. MOUNTFORD.

University of Liverpool

A CZECH METRICIAN.

ANT. KOLÁŘ: *Die Logaoöden, Ueberprüfung neuerer Lösungen einer alten Frage*. Pp. 140. (Travaux de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université Komenský à Bratislava, No. XIII.) Bratislava, 1933. Paper, Kč. 30 (about 5s.).

THIS monograph is the result of an attempt to solve the problems presented by the 'gemischte metrische Reihen, die sogenannte Logaoöden,' as a preliminary to the production of a handbook of Greek and Roman metric, on which K. is now engaged. K. writes in German, since his chief aim is to supersede the metrical theories now generally current in Germany. He displays a wide knowledge of modern metrical literature, including the important work of the late Joseph Král, which being mainly written in Czech is almost completely unknown in this country.

The very title of K.'s work indicates the standpoint from which he approaches the problem. Those who (like the present reviewer) accept the evidence of Hephaestion as a basis for their metrical studies only employ the word 'logaoedic' in the very restricted sense in which H. uses it (to cover lines which begin with unmistakable dactyls and end in unmistakable trochees, like the Alcaic Decasyllable and the Praxilean). The use of the term to cover almost all the varieties of Aeolic metre (in which sense alone could 'die Logaoöden' provide sufficient matter for an extended study) is entirely without justi-

fication in the ancient authorities, and is due to G. Hermann. Like him (and like most English metricians), K. rejects the evidence of Hephaestion out of hand; and he attempts to construct a system of scansion for the Aeolic metres which recognizes only dactyls, anapaests, trochees and iambs as possible elements. The results of this attempt can be seen most clearly in the table of the forms in which logaoedic metres are found in our literary sources (pp. 103-105). This requires fourteen different categories, from the Catalectic Dipody to the Acatalectic Hexapody, besides four forms (including the important Alcaic Decasyllables of Alc. fr. 43. 2 and 63 Diehl) which do not fit any of the categories. In the opinion of the present reviewer, K. has failed to make out a case for the adoption of his theory: the chief importance of his monograph is that it shows clearly the points on which the various forms of the quadrisyllabist theory are inadequate.

On the question of method, two comments must be made. (1) K. seems altogether to disregard the possibility of any development in the use of the Aeolic metres during the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. (2) K. depends exclusively on Diehl for his texts. This is certainly wrong for Alcaeus and Sappho; and very dangerous in the case of other authors, as there are many cases in which Diehl's readings are by no means the most probable.

The book is extremely well printed:

it is not easy to understand how it can be done at the price, unless the production of this series is heavily subsidi-

dized. There are indices of passages quoted and of types of line discussed.

J. A. DAVISON.

University of Manchester.

AN ITALIAN EDITION OF THE AJAX.

Sofocle *Aiace*: Introduzione e Commento di MARIO UNTERSTEINER. Pp. 321. Milan: Signorelli, 1933. Paper, L. 10.

THIS is a painstaking work, and though, apart from the Introduction, there is little that is original, it summarizes well what has been written on the *Ajax*, and the notes contain much interesting matter. The Introduction falls into two parts. The first traces the story through Homer, the Cyclic poets, and Aeschylus; the second deals with the play psychologically, and must prove rather heavy going for the youngsters in the *scuole medie* for whom it is intended, unless they have been brought up on a diet of Pirandello. The editor explains the play as an affirmation of *due verità*, and we hear much of the clash of two principles, the human and divine, the real and ideal, *φρόνησις* and *νόσος*, *τὸ πιθανόν* and *τὰ πιστά*. The analysis is not easy to follow, and more advanced students might find it difficult to grasp the idea that Menelaus 'projects his joy of living in what we might perhaps call his joy in the conservation of the collective organism.'

The commentary often refers to the views formulated in the Introduction,

but, generally speaking, is clear, succinct and judicious. The editor gives the different views of his predecessors with reasons for his own choice. He is particularly careful in his explanation of particles, but some of his syntax notes are old-fashioned. He claims for the *Ajax* that it contains more alliteration than any other play of Sophocles, but he overdoes the emphasis laid on it (e.g. in 706 *ἄχος ἀπ' ὀμμάτων* 'Ἀρης intensifies *il tripudio di gioia*).

In the text he generally adheres to L, though he sometimes prints without comment words that are not in the text, and sometimes has one reading in the text and explains another in the notes. There is no critical apparatus nor any account of the MSS.

The book contains a full bibliography and indices of Italian and Greek words; these would be more useful if they referred to the line in the text instead of the paragraph in the commentary. There are two full and useful notes in the Introduction, one on the monologue of Ajax (646-692), the other on the connection of the second part of the play with the first.

A. S. OWEN.

Keble College, Oxford.

ARISTOPHANES TRANSLATED.

Aristophanes in English Verse. Vol. II. By ARTHUR S. WAY. Pp. 273. London: Macmillan, 1934. Cloth, 10s. 6d.

It is satisfactory that the late Dr. Way was able to complete his translation of Aristophanes. This second volume contains the last five comedies, and exhibits the same merits and flaws as its predecessor which appeared in 1927. Once more Dr. Way has translated the iambs into rhyming decasyllables, and the trochaic and anapaestic tetrameters into the corresponding English metre, the latter with a double internal

rhyme in the Gilbertian manner. For the lyrics he has used various metres, often with a very attractive lilt, but often going as far away from the words as from the metre of the original.

He shows much ingenuity in rendering the jokes, but sometimes he strains too much after modern and not very apposite equivalents. At times his translation is far-fetched: thus in *Ran.* 303 'The storm lulls—lo! sweet peas in azure hair,' is very far removed from the original; the point of the joke would be better retained by something like 'After the storm how easily we

sail.' But some of the jokes are excellently done, such as Dionysus' reference to his 'stern fate' in the boat. One special *tour de force* is the rendering of the mock-Euripidean chorus and monody (*Ran.* 1309 *sqq.*) with suggestions of the metre and language of well-known popular ballads, e.g. 'O where and o where is my little rooster gone?' and 'Way up into the heights of heaven far, far he flew.'

The translation is apt to be diffuse: e.g. *Ran.* 1436 is rendered—

'The one has given a counsel of perfection,
The other a plain and practical direction.'

Contrast this with Rogers: 'One is so

clever and so clear the other.' So too ἀλλ' ὃ φιλοφδὸν γένος, παύτασθε (*Ran.* 240) takes fourteen words in the English. The rendering of the stanza about Milanion (*Lys.* 781) is very pleasant with much dash and humour, but it is more than half as long again as that of Rogers.

Dr. Way has boldly translated the whole plays with no omissions; he avoids αἰσχρολογία, but the innuendos are as clear as in the original, and it would have to be a very innocent reader who did not see what was meant.

A. S. OWEN.

Keble College, Oxford.

ΠΕΡΙ ΑΕΡΩΝ ΤΑΑΤΩΝ ΤΟΠΩΝ.

Wanderarzt und Aitiologie: Studien zur hippokratischen Schrift περὶ ἀέρων ὑδάτων τόπων. Von HANS DILLER. (Philologus, Supplementband xxvi, Heft 3.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1934. Paper, M. 7.60.

IN this book H. Diller adds to his own previous work on *π. ἀέρων ὑδάτων τόπων* (on the transmission of the text) and to the steadily growing literature on it, of which he begins by giving a useful summary. As against the views that *π. ἀέρων* is really two works by one author (held by Wilamowitz etc.), that it is a number of works by a number of authors (Edelstein), and that it is one work by one author (Deichgräber), Diller argues that it is two works by two authors, one of whom knew the writing of the other. The ground for this curious view seems to be, chiefly, the impossibility of showing that the purpose of the two parts of the treatise is identical. The second part is, he maintains, an aetiological treatise, whose favourite 'cause' is climate. Man is ultimately a part of 'nature,' and the business of explaining him is thus considerably simplified and rationalized. Diller also supports the view that *π. ἀέρων* part i. and *π. ἰρῆς νούσου* are by a single author, though the latter is an aetiological treatise also like part ii., and, while on a somewhat more ambitious scale than the latter, is very similar to it in its method; and this method, because it seeks to find prin-

ciples and causes which admit of the widest application, is a more scientific one than is found elsewhere in the Hippocratic corpus. Thus we are not surprised to hear that the author of *π. ἀέρων* part ii. was probably not a medical man. On the one side, this part must have been closely related, both in manner and in outlook, to the aetiological writings of Democritus (though not actually one of them, according to Diller), and on the other side it has affinities with the spirit of *ἱστορίη* of Herodotus and Hecataeus—the two traditions which helped to make possible the scientific work of Aristotle.

There is an easy explanation why parts i. and ii. were conflated into one treatise. Both authors belonged to the same Democritean circle; *π. ἰρῆς νούσου* and *π. ἀέρων* part i. and *π. ἀέρων* part ii. circulated together round this circle; and when they got into the Hippocratic corpus, part ii. had stuck to part i., and so it is to this day.

The book would probably have gained by more concise expression. The least convincing part of it (as always) is the aetiologizing about authors; the really valuable part is its notable contribution towards assigning a definite place to *π. ἀέρων ὑδάτων τόπων* in the general development of thought. For the future, Herr Diller promises us a new edition of the text.

A. L. PECK.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

THE BUDÉ REPUBLIC.

Platon. Oeuvres complètes. Tome vii. (Parts 1 and 2). *La République*. Livres iv.-x. Texte établi et traduit par ÉMILE CHAMBRY. Pp. 372 and 248. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1933 and 1934. Paper, 30 fr. and 22 fr.

THERE is nothing material to add to what was said in the notice of the first volume of the Budé *Republic* (which contained the first three books and M. Diès' introduction) except to express gratification that M. Chambry has now completed his translation, and produced a most readable and graceful, as well as careful, piece of work. If one is to criticize, it is that here and there in the translation the vigour of the Greek is somewhat abated or its force altered. For example, there is a distinct loss of vigour at 521 b, where for the original *δεῖ γὰρ μὴ ἐραστὰς τοῦ ἀρχεῖν ἵεναι ἐπ' αὐτό· εἰ δὲ μὴ, οἳ γε ἀντερασταὶ μαχοῦνται* we read 'il ne faut pas que l'on recherche le pouvoir avec passion; autrement, il y aura rivalités et batailles'; there is alteration at 549 b: *τῷ τε μετέχοντι τῆς τοῦ φιλοχρημάτων φύσεως* becomes 'parce qu'il porte en lui des germes de l'avarice.' And I think, too, that the emotional and artistic effect of

the last sentence of the last book is lost when the translation of *εἰδὲ πρᾶττωμεν* does not come at the very end (but did not Jowett the same?).

But the work as a whole is not seriously affected by these points.

The notes, as in the first volume, are something of a puzzle; they 'partake of many natures.' Many of them are useless to those who know already, insufficient for those who do not. Occasionally they contain warnings and moral animadversions, for example, against the 'communistic' proposals in the fifth book; again, at 499 c we read, 'Je ne veux pas dire que les idées' (notions, not Forms) 'de Platon soient des chimères; mais . . .' At 540 c 'Platon est féministe: il applaudirait aux tendances des États modernes qui font . . . une place de plus en plus large à la femme'; and during the tenth book Plato is asked point-blank whether he would really prefer to be a cobbler rather than a Zeuxis or an Apelles. It is hard to believe that this sort of note helps very much; but the translation and the introduction make a noble pair, of which the Budé series may well be proud.

A. L. PECK.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

THE LOEB VERSION OF ARISTOTLE'S PHYSICS.

Aristotle: The Physics. With an English Translation by PHILIP H. WICKSTEED and FRANCIS M. CORNFORD. Vol. II, Bks. V-VIII. Pp. viii + 440. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press), 1934. Cloth, 10s.; leather, 12s. 6d.

AFTER five years Professor Cornford has completed his none too easy task of reconstructing for publication the version of the *Physics* which Dr. Wicksteed left unfinished. When Dr. Wicksteed died, his work on Books V and VII, which he did not regard as authentic, was still in an especially imperfect condition. Professor Cornford has accordingly been encouraged to drastic revision, and he confesses to

minor corrections throughout, and to a certain amount of rewriting even in VI and VIII. Possibly also it became more and more evident to Professor Cornford that the means by which Dr. Wicksteed had hoped to produce a popular translation for the ordinary educated public were the wrong means. The only possible advance beyond the barest outline of Aristotle's system is through his technical terms. By evading them there is nothing to be gained, and nearly everything to be lost. In any case the second volume of the Loeb translation leaves a much more uniform and scholarly impression than the first. Fewer loosely paraphrastic passages have had to be reduced in footnotes to the discipline of more literal translation.

Technical terms are treated with greater respect, though I doubt if either 'shortage' or 'non-accomplishment' is a satisfactory rendering of *στέρησις*. I have, too, a suspicion that *εἶδος* in 234b 5, 6, and 12 means only 'shape,' and neither 'condition' nor 'quality' nor 'form.'

Professor Cornford has given us in this volume a greater quantity of good textual and explanatory notes, which culminate in a thorough and original treatment of VIII. 10. This suggests

that in normal circumstances he might have produced an excellent full-dress edition of the *Physics*. That after centuries of silence on the part of English scholarship Professor Cornford's first volume should coincide with the Oxford translation, and his second shortly precede Dr. Ross's forthcoming edition, is an unfortunate case of overlap.

G. R. G. MURE.

Merton College, Oxford.

AN ITALIAN SCHOLAR ON THE POETICS.

FERDINANDO ALBEGGIANI: *Aristotele, La Poetica*. Introduzione, traduzione, commento. Pp. cxxix + 144. Florence: 'La Nuova Italia,' 1934. Paper, L. 14.

AFTER the sixteenth century the Poetics was little studied in Italy until Croce revived interest in aesthetics. Since then, with the recent 'return to the classical tradition,' Italy has been more prolific than even Germany in studies of the Poetics. The latest and not least addition to the series is this by Professor Albeggiani.

The translation is based on Rostagni's text, with a few minor changes, and is accurate and lucid. The commentary expounds briefly the philosophical rather than the linguistic and historical import of the Poetics. Within its limits it is admirably clear, though it has even for its own purpose omissions and over-brief and dogmatic solutions of difficult points (e.g. 50a25, 50b7, 54a4).

A fuller exposition is however given in the 130 pages of the introduction, the most important and original part of the book. Chapters I-VI, on the text, the alleged second book (well argued if unconvincing), the difficulties (or negligences), the unity and the origins, and on Plato's aesthetic, and chap. XI, on the Poetics in the history of thought, resume and criticize the conclusions of research to date very clearly and subtly, and for the most part persuasively, especially in describing the relation of Aristotle's thought to Plato's. But the more original chapters VII-X, containing

another assault on *κάθαρσις*, are much less sure of themselves, and slip into self-contradictions, e.g. chap. VIII, on *φιλάνθρωπον*, or into vague phrases about idealizing, destiny, objectifying, muses, spiritualizing, which have little relation to Aristotle. To build a modern theory of aesthetics on the basis of the Poetics is one thing; it is another to read such a theory into the Poetics; but Sig. Albeggiani, for all his care not to, does the latter because he does not enough use the Rhetoric on pity and terror, and the light which the Ethics can throw on such terms as *ἀμαρτία*, *ἦθος*, *διάνοια*, on the mean, and, even more, on Aristotle's whole notion of moral goodness. *Κάθαρσις* is spoken of as purifying sometimes homeopathically by arousing emotions, and sometimes by not arousing them, and it is implied that the average man in life suffers from Weltschmerz and excess of pity, and vague phrases of a 'moral harmony' attempt to persuade us that the suffering of a tragic hero is deserved and satisfies our sense of justice. Even so *κάθαρσις* becomes no longer moral, but somehow purely aesthetic. An attempt to find a new kind of poetical universal and poetical logic, where the possible is superior to the actual, conceals the cruder and unfortunately less analysed idea which Aristotle continued to express by the word *μίμησις*. But a *μίμησις* is surely not such because it is a logical unity.

The whole argument is, however, carefully and subtly constructed, and attempts to find a coherent and posi-

tive view of poetry which takes account of all the Poetics, and it is very stimulating to thought, even where one agrees with it.

A few slips may be noted. At 99a36 'comic' should be read for 'tragic'

(τὸ γελοῖον πρόσωπον), and at 52a21 'propter hoc non è post hoc' should surely be reversed, and perhaps on page lxxv λόγος and μῦθος.

C. G. HARDIE.

British School at Rome.

THE LOEB STRABO AND ATHENAEUS.

H. L. JONES: *The Geography of Strabo with an English translation.* In eight volumes. VIII. Pp. 510; 3 maps. C. B. GULICK: *Athenaeus, The Deipnosophists, with an English translation.* In seven volumes. V. Pp. xi+550; illustrations. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (New York: Putnams), 1932, 1933. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) each.

THESE volumes have some misprints, of which a few are worth remark: Str. xvii 1 11 τοῦτο for -ον, 1 17 a false comma after 'virtues,' 1 41 ἐξηκοντα-σταδίων printed as two words, 3 7 a false comma after the tenth word; Ath. 502a (note) ἐπινόμην for ἐπινόμεν, 516f a false stop after βατάνια. Misrenderings:—Str. xvii 1 1 ἐπιμεν 'traverse,' 1 15 'it has' for 'they have' and 'though' for 'whereas,' 3 15 'for the most part root-eaters and meat-eaters' for 'r. more than m.'; Ath. 461d ἦν μεγάλα ποτήρια 'the cups must have been large' (contrast the neglect of τὸ in 468f *ad init.*), 464d-e φιλοδόξους 'philosophers,' 496b ἀνατρέπουσιν 'turn,' 502b Χαλκίδος 'Chalcidice,' 523e-f ὑπὸ τὴν Μίλητον ἔθειον 'pros-

pered under the protection of M.,' 526d παρωκεανιτῶν 'living on the sea-coast' (whence a mistranslation of δὲ), 534b τοῦ καλοῦ Ἀλκιβιάδου 'noble,' 548e πολλῶ χρόνῳ κτησάμενος 'held for a long time.' In 475a the iambic trimeter with a fourth spondee comes from Macrobius: but why retain Madvig's conjecture which gives a trimeter with a fourth dactyl in 464a? In Athenaeus's only mention of Diodorus Siculus, at 541e, ἐν τοῖς περὶ Βιβλιοθήκης is surely an error for ἐν τῇ Ἱστορικῇ Βιβλιοθήκῃ.

The translator of Strabo has finished his long labour, for which scholarship is much beholden to him. An index nearly 300 pages long of proper names and subjects worthily crowns the work.

Of the Athenaeus there is more to come, and it is good to find that in the present volume Dr Gulick is at his best. The version and the notes are alike valuable, and the volume is enriched by photographs illustrating a score of the vessels which are the chief theme of Book XI.

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

ORPHEUS AND COMMON SENSE.

W. K. C. GUTHRIE: *Orpheus and Greek Religion.* A Study of the Orphic Movement. Pp. xix+287; 15 plates, 19 illustrations in text. London: Methuen, 1935. Cloth, £1 1s.

IT was high time that someone in this country should produce a book explaining clearly and at moderate length exactly what is known of the religion named after Orpheus, with such addition of modest conjecture as might seem to him fitting, but without far-reaching speculations as to its derivation from savage cults (at present, in view of the state of our knowledge, rather hypo-

thetical for that region) and its survival in Christianity or elsewhere. Mr. Guthrie has supplied the want, and gratitude for this good deed far outweighs the doubts and disagreements which arise here and there in the reviewer's mind with regard to some details.

He spends five chapters setting forth the facts about the literature handed down to us,—or rather, for the most part, painfully scraped together from the miscellaneous writers who quote it,—as being by Orpheus or his followers, adding of course his own views

with
and t
with
writ
he ha
the o
and t
gram
even
will s
briefl
than
in no
attem
pre-p
sophi
Pytha
in his
had a
ligion
and it
Those
of the
Plato
Gree
Ha
which
likely
Mr. C
more
headi
chapt
and i
which
of the
as clo

ADOL
Pp.
193
THIS
path
Kern
differ
detail
Roma
concl
Orph
Plato
Phan
and C
Night
Ge (c
the G

with regard to the age of the fragments and the history of the cult, together with some modest criticisms of other writers' theories. It is to be noted that he has taken the trouble to construe the often crabbed Greek of the *Orphica*, and that he refuses to fly in the face of grammar and set the context at naught even to get an attractive rendering that will suit his hypotheses. These are, briefly, that Orphism is hardly older than 600 B.C. or thereabouts; that it is in no sense primitive, but rather an attempt at a systematic theology of a pre-philosophic type, yet not anti-philosophic, for, if Mr. Guthrie is right, Pythagoras tried essentially to re-express in his manner what these theologians had set forth in theirs. It was a religion with a definite creed and dogma, and it was always the religion of a few. Those few influenced a certain number of the best thinkers, including of course Plato, but remained alien to normal Greek thought.

Having expounded these ideas, in which the reviewer sees much that is likely and little that can be disproved, Mr. Guthrie goes on to somewhat more speculative matter, very honestly heading an appendix to his sixth chapter 'Theories of Orphic Ritual,' and in the text of the chapter itself, which describes the 'Life and Practices of the Follower of Orpheus,' keeping as close to admitted fact as he can. The

seventh chapter sketches the relations between Orpheus and other 'Greek thinkers,' poets and philosophers; it may be questioned whether it was worth spending two out of its thirty pages in refuting Macchiore. The last chapter outlines, very briefly indeed, the post-classical history of the cult, or sect, or whatever we choose to call it.

The reviewer hopes to deal with this work at a little more length in the *J.H.S.*, and there to touch on some minor points of disagreement. Here it is enough to mention one not unimportant matter, namely, the fairly obvious origin of Orphism (whatever its precise date) from the lower and unprivileged classes. With this agree the attempts to rival Homer, or outdo him, in age as in inspiration; the otherworldliness, in the sharpest contrast to the attitude inherited from the Achaian gentry (Mr. Guthrie most rightly points out that Pindar's normal views are distinctly un-Orphic); the patronage of the Orphics by Peisistratos and his family, in accordance with the normal policy of tyrants, who regularly favoured the poorer and lower sections of the population. That Mr. Guthrie does not sufficiently allow for this is the one defect which seems to me to damage more than a few details of this excellent book.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

ORPHISM.

ADOLF KRUEGER: *Quaestiones Orphicae*. Pp. 79. Halle: printed by E. Karras, 1934. Paper.

THIS doctoral dissertation follows the path of men like Schuster, Gruppe and Kern in the attempt to disentangle different strata of Orphic doctrine from detailed analysis mainly of Graeco-Roman writings. Its most important conclusions are these. The earliest Orphic theogony (and the one used by Plato) began with Night and contained Phanes, who together with Ouranos and Ge sprang from the egg laid by Night. Men are sons of Ouranos and Ge (cp. the claim made by the soul on the Gold Plates), and the anthropogony

dependent on the story of Dionysos torn by the Titans is later. (One misses here some reference to the *Τιτανική φύσις* of Plato, *Laws* 701c.) With Night was associated Adrasteia-Ananke. The Hieronymian version drew on this one, substituting Chronos for Night, and the Rhapsodies adopted Chronos, not necessarily in the same form, from the Hieronymian. K. distinguishes a *ἱερὸς λόγος* (Hdt. 2. 81, Plato, *Laws* 715e, Plut. *Quaest. Symp.* 2. 3. 2 etc.) from the Rhapsodic *ἱεροὶ λόγοι*, and argues that the former contained the theogony in its oldest form. This *ἱερὸς λόγος* was attributed to Pythagorean circles (Kern, *test.* 222), and contained

Pythagorean doctrines, (a) transmigration (Plato, *Phaedo* 70c, *ep.* 7, 335a etc.), (b) number-doctrine, for the Hymn to Number (Kern, *fr.* 309 ff.) is a part of the original *ἱερός λόγος*. (This argument is weakened by the assumption that every mention of *ἱερός λόγος*, or even, as in Plato, *ep.* 7, of *ἱεροὶ λόγοι*, refers to this particular Orphic *ἱερός λόγος*.) The earliest Orphics worshipped Phanes=the Sun, and had no connexion with Dionysos (hence Aeschylus' *Bassarids*). They were from the first preachers of the future life, hence the prominence of the Sun in descriptions of Elysium (e.g. Pind. *Ol.* 2. 67). The earliest system did not teach transmigration, which was evolved from it by Pythagoras. Lastly the existence of a poem called *Τελευταί* by Onomacritus is asserted, and a reconstruction attempted, with material primarily drawn from *Orph. Arg.* 17-27.

This detailed argument from late sources can probably never be final. Each scholar criticizes his predecessors on some points, but seems equally open to criticism on others. On p. 17 K. succeeds in making an argument of Gruppe's seem trivial, but is this of his own more convincing (p. 11): 'Quod Orpheus hoc loco (sc. in theogonia Hieronymiana) Necessitatem διωργυωμένην ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ, τῶν περάτων αὐτοῦ ἐφαπτομένην vocat, Argonauticorum poeta absque dubio adiectivo ἀμέγαρτον eandem magnitudinem exprimit'?

Dr. Krueger would have done well to take more notice of Gruppe, and in general to be less fond of phrases like 'Somniis priorum remotis . . .'

W. K. C. GUTHRIE.

Peterhouse, Cambridge.

LATER GREEK RELIGION.

WILHELM NESTLE: *Griechische Religiosität von Alexander d. Gr. bis auf Proklos* (*Die griechische Religiosität in ihren Grundzügen und Hauptvertretern von Homer bis Proklos*, III). Pp. 190. Berlin: de Gruyter (Sammlung Götschen, 1080), 1934. Cloth, RM. 1.62.

THIS volume concludes Dr. Nestle's well-written and thoughtful outline of a most fascinating subject (for the earlier parts, see *C.R.*, Vol. xlv, p. 86; Vol. xlviii, p. 174). It was perhaps the hardest of the three to compose satisfactorily, owing to the wide range in time and space, the variety of religious and cultural types, and the vastness of the specialist literature with which the author must deal. It says much for his ingenuity that he has contrived to be always interesting and almost always accurate and up to date; while the sketches of outstanding personalities and their thought are something better than ingenious. The worst defect is that the literature used seems to have been wholly German, thus failing to include some of the best works on the subject, such as Nock's *Conversion*; but this, in a series intended primarily for German readers, is a fault very hard

to avoid. The titles of the first nine sections are enough to show that familiar, indeed inevitable, lines have been followed in sketching the period. They are: *Die Kultur des Hellenismus und das römische Reich*; *Herrscherkult und Gottmenschen*; *Die hellenische Götterwelt*; *Das Vordringen orientalischer Religionen*; *Wandlungen im Wesen der griechischen Religiosität*; *Der astrologische Glaube*; *Die Dämonisierung der Religion*; *Der solare Monotheismus*; *Philosophie als Ersatz der Religion*; and then follows a series of typical figures, beginning with Xenokrates and ending with Proclus. These are well chosen; it might perhaps be asked whether one or two Latin writers, such as Manilius and the younger Seneca, could not have been profitably included, for the author is of course much too well informed to imagine that the Roman culture of that epoch was sharply differentiated from the Greek. The salient features of each have been sketched with much insight, although a certain impatience with the mystical and sentimental sides of religious feeling perhaps causes less than justice to be done to one or two.

There are a few doubtful statements.

On p. 52, the author does not seem to realize that the famous 'Mithrasliturgie' in the Parisian magical papyrus is no longer considered to be such. The last paragraph on p. 87 differentiates popular and educated religion too sharply; and on p. 178 the peroration shows something of the influence of a new god whose name is Hitler. Minor points are (p. 23) that Menander, frag. 609, refers, not to the planets, which are not made visible by the sun, but to such deities as the earth; p. 28, the δαίμων

συγγενής who is μυσταγωγὸς τοῦ βίου of Menander, frag. 550, has nothing to do with any ideas about immortality. P. 89, a small slip (tacitly corrected on p. 95) makes the Pythagorean χρυσᾶ ἔπη into 'goldene Worte.' P. 133, the Biblical narratives of the Entry into Jerusalem do not imply that there was anything miraculous in the finding of the ass, but rather that arrangements had been made for it to be available.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

PORPHYRY AND AUGUSTINE.

WILLY THEILER: *Porphyrios und Augustin*. Pp. 74. (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswiss. Klasse, Jahr 10, Heft 1.) Halle: Niemeyer, 1933. Stiff paper, RM. 7.

IN this important essay Prof. Theiler aims at breaking quite new ground. That the *libri Platonici* which Augustine read in Victorinus' Latin version (*Conf.* vii. 13, viii. 3) were, or at any rate included, certain works of Plotinus and Porphyry has hitherto been the accepted view. The primary thesis of Theiler's book is that Augustine never read Plotinus at all, and that the sole source of his Neoplatonic doctrine is Porphyry. The objection that Augustine shows knowledge of a number of passages of the *Enneads*, and not infrequently names Plotinus as his authority, is countered by the assumption that he found these passages quoted in Porphyry. Theiler points out that whereas Victorinus is known to have translated at least one work of Porphyry, there is no trace, apart from Augustine, of an early Latin version of the *Enneads*; and he thinks it unlikely that such a translation would have been attempted when the doctrine was accessible in the less abstruse exposition of Porphyry. But to establish his thesis he has to show that Augustine reproduces the Neoplatonic system in the Porphyrian, not the Plotinian form; and this he undertakes to do. The enterprise is a difficult one; for the bulk of Porphyry's writings (including, according to Theiler, all those used by Augustine) are lost to us, and

the impression derived from those which remain is that the difference between the master's teaching and the pupil's (after he became a pupil) was a difference less of substance than of emphasis. How then shall we distinguish 'Porphyrian' matter from Plotinian? Theiler claims to answer the question with the help of the principle ('Arbeitssatz') that 'any doctrine found in a later Neoplatonist which has a close parallel in Augustine but none, or one less close, in Plotinus, must be derived from Porphyry' (p. 4); and he thinks that in this way the original Porphyrian text can be to a large extent recovered. Armed with this weapon, he proceeds in Part I to analyse exhaustively (with illustrations from other works) an early essay of Augustine, the *de vera religione*, in which he discovers extensive use of a Porphyrian original. In appendices to this part he examines and emends a passage from Porphyry's *ἀπορρηταί* (38. 7 ff. Mommert), supplying parallels from Augustine; argues (with great probability) that the discussion on self-knowledge in the tenth book of Augustine's *de Trinitate* is based on Porphyry's treatise *Περὶ τοῦ Ἰνῶθι σεαυτὸν*, extracts from which are preserved in Stobaeus; and traces back *civ. dei* xix. 12-17 to another Porphyrian original. Finally, in Part II he gives us a summary treatment of the *Confessions* with the aim of distinguishing and contrasting the 'Porphyrian' and the Pauline strands in the fabric.

Professor Theiler's learning is impressive, and he has unearthed some curious

and striking parallels. It certainly appears that Augustine knew his Porphyry better than anyone had supposed. But some reservations seem to me necessary, in regard both to Theiler's way of formulating his 'Arbeitssatz' and to the use which he makes of it. Clearly, the principle is valid only on the assumption that Plotinus and Porphyry are the sole possible sources common to Augustine and the later Neoplatonists. Is not this assumption just a little hazardous? Is it, for example, entirely certain that Augustine had read nothing of Iamblichus, who comes between Plotinus and Porphyry in his list of Greek Platonists *valde nobilitati* (civ. dei viii. 12)? Be that as it may, some of Theiler's applications of his principle appear decidedly questionable. Thus he invokes it (p. 22) to account for the conception of the soul as μέση οὐσία in Sallustius (32. 30 Nock) and in Augustine. But precisely this conception is presented in *Enn.* IV. viii. 7 *init.* and III. ii. 8 *init.* And that the latter passage was known both to Augustine and to Sallustius seems highly probable, since the illustration of the head and the members, by which Plotinus there exemplifies degrees of value, (a) reappears in Sallustius *l.c.*, (b) is reproduced by Augustine (*de ordine* II. 4) in association with another example from the same essay (the executioner, III.

ii. 17 *fin.*). In the same Plotinian treatise we meet the conceptions of ἀξία (240. 27 Volk.), τάξις (*ibid. et passim*, espec. 231. 13 ff.), and σύνταξις (232. 17); yet Theiler (p. 18 f.) for some reason regards these as specifically Porphyrian. And from the same source (230. 18 ff.) may come Augustine's allusions to the 'Kreislauf der Elemente,' which Theiler by another misuse of his principle attributes (p. 13) to Porphyry. —Such examples, which could be multiplied if space permitted, may indicate that Theiler's results should not be too hastily accepted *en bloc*. They also suggest that of a few Plotinian treatises (I think only of a few) Augustine possessed a more complete and detailed knowledge than we should expect him to acquire either from isolated quotations in Porphyry or from Porphyrian paraphrases. They suggest, in fact, that the saint was speaking neither more nor less than the truth when he wrote of himself *lectis Plotini paucissimis libris* (*de beata vita* 4), as well as in the *Confessions* where he claims to have read *not libros Platonici* but *libros Platoniorum*. But while I am not convinced by Theiler's central thesis, I cordially recommend his interesting book to the serious attention of all students whether of Neoplatonism or of Augustine.

E. R. DODDS.

University of Birmingham.

LIFE AND LETTERS IN EGYPT.

Life and Letters in the Papyri. By J. G. WINTER. Pp. viii+308. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1933. Cloth, \$3.50.

Select Papyri. With an English translation by A. S. HUNT and C. C. EDGAR. Volume II. Pp. xxxviii+608. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1934. Cloth, 10s.; leather, 12s. 6d.

THE first of these volumes contains the Jerome Lectures delivered before the American Academy in Rome and at the University of Michigan in 1929 and 1930. 'Life' is represented in the first four chapters, which present a very readable and well-documented account of chosen aspects of the life of Roman

Egypt as reflected in the non-literary papyri. 'Letters' are the subjects of Chapters V and VI, which deal respectively with Egyptian additions to Greek Poetry and to Greek Prose.

Chapter I illustrates the relations between Rome and Egypt, and the impression which each made on the other. It refers to visits and communications from Emperors and other distinguished Romans, the corn trade, the social position of resident Romans, the scant traces of interest in Latin literature and of the use of Latin, and uses letters like those of Apollinaris and Apion to illustrate the service of Egyptians in the Roman fleet. The two following chapters cover ground

already made familiar by Deissmann, Milligan and others, and paint a vivid picture of the life of the common people of Egypt in their family relations and working conditions under the grinding oppression of Rome and against the drab background of the Egyptian countryside. In Chapter IV Mr Winter, using several of the letters in Ghedini's collection and adding references to many others, deals sensibly with the delicate criteria by which Christian letters are distinguished from pagan in the pre-Constantinian period, and with the growth of distinctively Christian formulae, and he adds much interesting information on Egyptian Christianity in the later centuries. Chapters V and VI contain an extraordinarily full account of the literary papyri, with references to literature. Such an account was badly needed and will be welcomed by classical scholars.

Throughout the book Mr Winter proves himself a sensible and acute critic, and important corrections have been made in the text or interpretation of many of the documents with which he deals. Typical of these are (p. 61) a lexical oddity *ἐχονομα* as a preposition with genitive (about this there seems to be no doubt), his interpretation (p. 155) of *ἀγορά* in *P. Ox.* viii 1161, and a new text (p. 166) of *P. Grenfell* I. 53. A valuable feature of the book is the extensive use made of unpublished papyri in the Michigan collection; oddly enough these papyri are somewhat shabbily treated in the otherwise full index—I have counted a dozen references, some of them of major interest, which are omitted in the index. A new literary papyrus of interest (p. 220) is a fragment of *O.C.* 136-145, which reads *ἀλεξήτωρ* with Laurentianus in l. 143. On two points of interpretation I do not think that Mr Winter has succeeded—his treatment of *ῥα* as local on p. 153,

and his assumption of accusative and infinitive in an imperative sense in *P. Fayum* 119 (p. 74). True, as Mr Winter says, this use is 'good Greek'—but surely too 'good' for this class of document.

No Roman province can be described in such vivid detail as Egypt, and Mr Winter has risen to the height of his opportunity.

Mr Winter deals in his book with over 250 documents; the second volume of the *Loeb Select Papyri* prints in whole or in part 434 documents; I have noticed only nine which are common to the two books. While this illustrates the amazing wealth of material on which the historian of Egypt may draw, it also emphasizes the difference in scope between the two volumes. For Mr Winter, 'Life' is in the main private life. The papyri relevant to this topic appeared in Volume I of the Loeb collection (even in it there is little overlapping with Mr Winter); the second volume is devoted to official documents classified under fourteen headings, e.g. Codes, Edicts, Petitions, (Public) Tenders and Contracts, and so on. The Introduction, full of references forward, gives a succinct account of the topics illustrated by the texts, which describe the (predominantly financial) relations of the Egyptians with their rulers in the Ptolemaic, Roman and Byzantine periods. The three final letters, dated A.D. 710, show the use of Greek lasting on under the Arab domination of Egypt.

Volume I was announced as the first of two volumes; Volume II is announced as the second of four. 'A selection from the new literary papyri is now in preparation and will follow in due course,' wrote Professor Hunt in February, 1934. The succeeding volumes will now fall to other hands, but will remain a monument to the pioneer work of Professor Hunt.

W. M. CALDER.

University of Edinburgh.

LITERARY CRITICISM IN ANTIQUITY.

J. W. H. ATKINS: *Literary Criticism in Antiquity. A sketch of its development.* Vol. I (Greek): pp. xi+199. Vol. II (Graeco-Roman): pp. xi+363. Cambridge: University Press, 1934. Cloth, 10s. and 15s.

In this work the Professor of English at Aberystwyth covers the period from Homer to Lucian, adding a few comments on later authors. It is intended not for 'classical specialists' but for 'viri boni' who are lettered enough to

know, without being told, the meaning of certain treacherous phrases like 'curiosa felicitas.' The bibliography is good, and includes Jensen on Philodemus and Rostagni on the *A.P.*

The subject notoriously lacks unity. With the precipitous swerve from Aristotle to—Hermagoras and the rest, we have left the main line of advance for a zigzag route in different territory, and progress is slow and often dubious. A. rightly notes more than once how small is the debt owed by later critics to Plato and Aristotle. But he began by assuming that the so-called 'development' is 'one continuous and unbroken movement,' and that therefore a rigid adherence to chronological order would of itself suffice to ensure coherence. As the assumption is false, coherence is lacking; and the 'vir bonus' is confronted with an undigested mass of details, learned (even ostentatiously so) but unilluminating, laudably free from the common vice of glib generalization, but curiously lacking in literary judgment. (The effect demonstrates the superiority of the method of approach adopted by Professor D'Alton in *Roman Literary Theory and Criticism*, whose chapter on 'Aspects of the Problem of Style' is more likely to be found instructive by specialist and non-specialist alike.) No plan could more effectively impede the emergence of those 'principles of enduring value' which it is A.'s professed aim to bring fully to light. Other factors tend to the same result: a love of repetitions (we are told some ten times that Dion. Hal.'s little 'appreciations' were new), a habit of wasting space on irrelevant matters (as in the three pages spent on the date of the *A.P.*, or in the scolding of Plutarch—who was so polite to literary critics—for not being a literary critic), and an unhappy style which does not avoid the hearty but unhelpful connective 'Then too,' or sentences like 'That it was as a corrective to this state of things that he wrote can scarcely be doubted.' Nor is any attempt made (as the author's profession might lead one to hope) to elucidate the use or abuse which critics from the Renaissance onwards have made of their ancient authorities. This was an opportunity missed; even

though it be admitted that 'classical doctrine was never really assimilated' by Renaissance scholars.

Certain sections lend themselves in a greater or less degree to A.'s methods and will impress the classical specialist as very competently done; the best are on Hellenistic poetics, and on the more strictly literary hints on composition to be found here and there in Plato. But there are numerous points on which A. might have been better served by the classical scholars whose help he acknowledges. In a thrice abbreviated notice I have space for but a few. His remarks on Homeric 'inspiration' should be corrected by *C.Q.* XXIII 148, XXVIII 113. The coupling of Theagenes and Anaxagoras as allegorists of the same type (p. 15) is misleading (*C.R.* XLI 214, *C.Q.* XXVIII 108). On Platonic 'imitation' A. fails to realize that the term (in the general sense of 'representation'—A. is wrong in thinking that up to *Rep.* 595b it means merely 'impersonation') has two uses (literal and metaphorical). On *Rep.* 600e he writes (p. 52): 'Yet he [Plato] also advances beyond this position; and indeed this is the position which he strives everywhere to refute, a fact that is not always fully realized'—a sentence which is either unintelligible or false. Naturally he regards (p. 50) Plato's attack on 'imitative' (in the bad sense) poetry as 'special pleading'—too easy an explanation, which also has to do for Aristotle's 'katharsis' (p. 86) and [Longinus'] view of the *Odyssey* (II p. 243). (On 'imitation' A. notes on p. 52 references to *C.Q.* XXII 16, XXVI 161 without any hint that his text is in fundamental disagreement with those articles. There are other instances of the same confusing practice.) The reference to *Rep.* 401 on p. 68 is belated; it should have been remembered on p. 44. Another reference missed in its proper place is *Phaedr.* 276 (p. 155), which would have been a valuable corrective to p. 61. It is sheer romanticism to read into Aristotle the view that both philosophy and poetry are 'avenues to the highest truth' (p. 80); and to say (p. 117) that throughout the *Poetics* he is 'for the most part content'

'to frame a reply to Plato's indictment' is surely (on any view) a grave exaggeration. On 'satura tota nostra est' A. (II p. 288) should have known of Hen-

drickson's authoritative article in *Class. Phil.* XXII pp. 46 sqq.

J. TATE.

University of St. Andrews.

GREEK HUMANISM.

E. DRERUP: *Der Humanismus in seiner Geschichte, seinen Kulturwerten und seiner Vorbereitung im Unterrichtswesen der Griechen*. Pp. 164. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1934. Paper, M. 7.60.

THIS work on the value of Greek humanism consists of four lectures. As we should expect from Professor Drerup, they are scholarly and thorough. There is a certain disconnection and lack of unity, due to the lectures having been given on different occasions, and (as in the beginning of the fourth lecture) there is some overlapping. The German is easily readable but heavy and pedestrian for a popular treatment of the subject, and a sentence like *durchweg nur durch private Beihilfen durchgeführt* is unhappy. The first lecture is a sketch of the development of humanism from the 14th to the 20th century. It attempts to compress into 65 pages what Sir John Sandys put into three volumes, but is as well done as the space allows. It suffers from the narrow interpretation—a common error—of 'humanist.' Drerup practically restricts the term to scholars in the narrow sense. In fact, if the influence of the classics on the character and on

the view and conduct of life is, as it is, the most important result of classical studies, Ascham, the Cambridge Platonists, Matthew Arnold and Pater are far more important as humanists than many of the scholars here mentioned. Until it is realized that humanism is more than classical technology, we shall not recover the spirit of the early, the true, humanists. Incidentally Sir F. Kenyon is not *jetzt Generaldirector des Britischen Museums* (p. 57). The second lecture is an insufficient and somewhat banal essay on the cultural values of the classics. The third and fourth lectures are the best in the book. The third discusses Greek elementary education and has an interesting sketch of its development in the Hellenistic Age. The fourth deals with higher education in Greece, and especially with the sophists, Isocrates, Plato and Aristotle. One regrets that Drerup does not develop his statement that *die wissenschaftliche Pädagogik unserer Tage im Grunde . . . eine griechische Wissenschaft ist*. This interesting but debatable point is neither argued nor illustrated.

R. W. LIVINGSTONE.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

A BIOGRAPHY OF THE GREEK PEOPLE.

C. F. LAVELL: *A Biography of the Greek People*. Pp. xiv+297. London: Routledge, 1934. Cloth, 8s. 6d.

THE aim of this book is 'to tell the story of the ancient Greeks with a view to seeing and showing what they did that permanently mattered'; because most histories 'excluded much that was of paramount importance, and included much that to most present-day minds is of no importance at all'—that is, excluded philosophy, art and letters, and said too much about wars and politics. There are however many

specialist histories of Greek philosophy, art and letters—or is it essential that one man should write of every phase of Greek life, in less than 300 pages?

The difficulties of such a task are well illustrated by this book. A good many pages are in fact devoted to wars, but not in such a manner as to show why the Greeks fought as much as and in the way that they did. Not only is the importance of their political experiments (government by discussion, the union of law and liberty, and so forth) belittled, but the history and nature

of the city-state is misunderstood.¹ 'The peace of Antalkidas . . . had practically shattered every dream of a free and united Greek state' (there were no such dreams); 'during the last twenty years of Aristotle's life the city-states practically ceased to exist'; most remarkable of all—the theory of the city-state that all citizens were of one blood and so should be equal had 'become obviously and manifestly untrue' in Athens by the action of Solon and Cleisthenes in encouraging foreigners to settle—the *demos* were not of the same blood as the nobles, had no ancestors—, and *therefore* Athens was bound to break up.² Equally misleading, though in a different way, is the statement that a man could not belong to a city in which he had not been born because its gods were not his gods. Is it any wonder that Professor Lavell seriously

misunderstands the political philosophy of Plato and Aristotle? And not only politics: Plato's philosophy was 'informal and unformed,' and 'his theory of the relation between appearances and reality was still—so to speak—in the air'; and it was left to Aristotle to give 'form and coherence to philosophy' and to make 'the theory of ideas solid, intelligible, consistent and practical.'

The references to more detailed literature are most of them out-of-date (e.g. Grant for Aristotle's life and works); and there are many small errors of detail, as the *three* plains of Attica (ignoring the Mesogeia), Pericles continuously strategos from 461 to 429, Polygnotus adorned the Parthenon; and when Professor Lavell would give a summary of the bronze age to contain only what is 'certainly true,' he includes the statement that the Achaeans arrived c. 1500 B.C., bringing with them the Greek language and 'the radiant gods of Olympus.' And it is certainly curious to find in a writer who would stress the importance of Greek thought at the expense of Greek politics the expression 'the great age of Athens, roughly 500-400 B.C.,' on a later page grudgingly extended to the death of Plato.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

¹ Social structure and economics are almost ignored. There is one gravely misleading statement—'the leaving of industry to slaves [already in 480] and the consequent ignoring both of economic problems and the application of science to the needs of daily life.'

² Another curious judgment is that the beauty of Greek vase-painting 'is as perplexing as it is unquestionable, for the human forms in which the Greek artists then and always delighted were stiff, emotionless and expressionless.'

MEGARIAN STUDIES.

KRISTER HANELL: *Megarische Studien*. Pp. 227. Lund: Lindstedt, 1934. Paper, Kr. 4.50.

THE work before us does not attempt to trace the history of Megara in all its aspects and throughout the whole of antiquity. It is no mere repetition or elaboration of E. L. Highbarger's *History and Civilization of Ancient Megara*, to the value of which as a collection of the relevant material Dr. Hanell pays a high tribute. Its scope is much narrower, so far as Megara herself is concerned, but its thoroughness and originality are correspondingly greater.

After surveying the evidence relative to Megara afforded by her monuments, inscriptions and coins, her language, traditions and cults, the author proceeds to discuss, largely on the basis of

divine and heroic legends, the affinities of pre-Dorian Megara. He concludes that, although we must reject the tradition that Megara was at that early period part of Attica as being a later invention designed to support Athenian political pretensions, Megara was in fact Ionian and had close connexions with Boeotia and Eleusis. The third chapter examines Dorian Megara, maintaining, chiefly on the evidence of cult, that the conquest and transformation of the city took place neither from the North nor from Corinth, but from Argos, while the fourth discusses the cults of Megara in historical times, especially in the archaic period, which witnessed the culmination of her wealth and influence, down to the triumph of Christianity.

The second half of the book deals with the colonizing activity and the colonial foundations of Megara in the West and the North-East, investigating first the traditional accounts of the planting of the daughter settlements, among which those of Byzantium offer especially knotty problems. A detailed examination of the political organization and of the cults of these colonies, for which epigraphical evidence is of primary importance, shows that in both these fields the influence of the metropolis is unmistakable and deep, while the colonial calendars also show striking

similarities. An appendix contains an admirable conspectus of the materials available for the study of the cults of the Megarian colonies.

Characterized throughout by an unsparing search for all the attainable evidence and critical acumen in its interpretation, excellently printed and commendably free from typographical errors, the book makes a contribution of permanent value to the study not only of Megara and her colonies but also of the numerous cults and legends which it discusses. MARCUS N. TOD.

Oriel College, Oxford.

DION.

RENATA VON SCHELIHA: *Dion: Die platonische Staatsgründung in Sizilien. Mit Münztafel und Karte.* Pp. viii + 166. (Das Erbe der Alten: Zweite Reihe XXV.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1934. Paper, M. 5.50 (bound, 6.50).

IN re-telling the well-known story of Plato's experiment in practical politics, and its sequel, the authoress has the great advantage of a clear and vigorous style, an orderly arrangement, and a complete mastery of the facts. She has also an unbounded enthusiasm for her hero, Dion, and her main purpose seems to be to vindicate his character and actions as against those modern historians who have seen in him something less than an ideally wise statesman carrying out the projects of an ideally—and practically—wise teacher. It may be doubted whether the book contains any solid grounds for revising the accepted estimate of Dion. Much use is of course made of Plato's letters, but it does not seem to occur to the writer that what they tell us is not necessarily what Dion was, but what Plato thought, or persuaded himself, he was. Nor is it really helpful to write, as she often does, in terms of vague rhetorical encomium, e.g. 'Je mehr Schwierigkeiten sich vor ihm auftürmten, je erbitterter die in allen Lagern stehenden Gegner gegen ihn kämpften, desto strenger und leidenschaftlicher stellte er sein Herrschertum und Jüngertum durch sich selbst dar. Dies war das Seine, was er tun konnte—das Gelingen musste er dem Schicksal

überlassen' (p. 66). For myself, I am not persuaded to retract the estimate given in the *Cambridge Ancient History* (not, by the way, 'Cambridge History of the World') and quoted here on p. 152.

It is to many people an irresistible temptation to find allusions to Sicilian history in Plato's later dialogues, and the authoress is not the first to find them in the *Politicus*. I do not think that many readers will believe that the myth of the two ages, of Kronos and of Zeus, has any connexion with contemporary events, and I must confess myself unable to understand the argument (p. 77) which establishes that connexion. Nor do I think that Plato, having Dion in mind, puts the statesman above the law. A careful reader of the latter part of the dialogue, or of Professor Taylor's excellent exposition of it, will see that Plato did not imagine that the ideally wise statesman, who may safely be set above the law, actually existed or was ever likely to exist; the 'second-best course' of *Pol.* 300c and *Laws* 875D was always recognized by Plato as the only course in practical politics.

It would be ungenerous to press these criticisms without emphasizing the fact that the narrative parts of the book, perhaps three-quarters of the whole, are excellent. Interesting, too, is the final chapter, which traces the references to Dion in ancient authors from Aristotle down to the Emperor Julian.

R. HACKFORTH.

Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

THE LOEB VOLUME OF MINOR LATIN POETS.

Minor Latin Poets with introductions and English translations by J. WIGHT DUFF and ARNOLD M. DUFF. Pp. xii + 838. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1934. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

THIS is a volume containing Grattius, Calpurnius, Nemesianus, Ausonius, Rutilius, the *sententiae* of Publilius Syrus, the *Aetna*, the *disticha Catonis*, and a dozen shorter works, in all about 7400 verses. As I soon saw that it would invite more comment than its importance would justify I have read through only Syrus, who comes first, and the slenderer authors: from the bulkier I have taken samples of 50 lines or more apiece. Since translation is the chief feature of this series I will say nothing of the recension or any subsidiary matter, and in the versions themselves I shall not notice a few places where words are omitted or where the reading translated is not that of the text, nor the rather more frequent cases where a sense has been invented for Latin which possesses none. Mistranslations proper will occupy me sufficiently; for not only are they numerous, but many of them are such as would not have been expected, and some are quite astounding.

In a miscellaneous collection of authors with some of whom the editors were not familiar a certain amount of stumbling was inevitable. To translate *Phoen. 90 uitali toro* as 'life-giving couch', though that is not the meaning of the term, was in view of the context a seductive error; but the rendering of 84 *mixto balsama cum folio* as 'balsam with its blended leaf' ought to have been dissatisfying and suspicious; and for mistranslating 54 *caput* as 'prince' and 49 *putetur* as jussive there was no excuse.

Imperfect knowledge of the meaning of words and phrases will account for much false rendering, as at Syr. 30 *delicias facit*, 70 *bonus animus*, 83 *tenebris*, 492 *paelicis*, 658 *summissum*, *el. in Maec.* I 135 *candoris*, II 5 *integer aeuo*, Calp. I 3 *feruentia*, 31 *sequaci*, *laud. Pis.* 96 and 229 *excusso*, 103 *fluidum*, 242 *gracilis*, *Aetn.* 244 *tenax*, *Nem. buc.* I 78 *tractabit*, *Pentad.* II 19 *incundat*, *Tiberian.* IV 13 *mundo*, 20 *premis*; but the translations

of Syr. 152 and 196 *quo*, 374 *decipitur*, 453 *solus*, 492 *nuptae*, 518 *crimen quaerere*, *laud. Pis.* 136 *summoto uulgo*, *Nem. cyn.* 65 *nostrum* show obtuseness to the requirements of sense; and to misunderstand in their context *el. in Maec.* I 24 *bene praecinctos*, 30 *durior*, *Gratt.* 80 *alternata res*, *Aetna* 16 *melius*, 21 *mendacia*, *Flor.* IX 2 *rex* needed remarkable inattention or perversity.

From words we come to sentences. I append the true renderings, though I am sometimes ashamed to do so, and at Syr. 319 *iratus nihil non criminis loquitur loco* 'an angry man has nothing but accusations to utter' I cannot bring myself to it.

Syr. 52 *aegre reprendas quod sinas consuescere* (it is hard to check what you allow to grow habitual) 'reproof comes ill for a habit you countenance'.

414 *mansueta* (domestic animals, see *Phaed.* III 7) *tutiora sunt sed seruiunt* 'the tame way is safer but it's the way of slaves'.

505 *peiora multo cogitat mutus dolor* (resentment, when mute, meditates much worse revenge) 'dumb grief thinks of much worse to come'. *cogito* is again misunderstood in 410 and 388 and 560.

537 *peccatum extenuat qui celeriter corrigit* (prompt amendment of an offence diminishes it) 'the quick corrector weakens sin'.

559 *quod timeas citius quam quod speres euenit* (fears are sooner fulfilled than hopes) 'the dreaded thing happens sooner than you might expect'.

607 *quam miserum est, ubi te captant, qui defenderent* (when those who should defend you seek occasion against you) 'when your supposed defenders take you prisoner'.

656 *secunda in paupertate fortuna est fides* (honesty is a second patrimony) 'faith is fortune renewed, i.e. if a man reduced to poverty retains a faith in better times to come, that is in some degree a restoration of fortune'.

el. in Maec. I 131 f. (*Hesperon*) *quem nunc in fuscis placida sub nocte nitentem | Luciferum contra currere cernis equis* (*in fuscis equis contra Luciferum*) 'thou canst see him now as Lucifer gleaming in the dark 'neath the stilly night and

chariotting his steeds on an opposite course'.

II 7-10 'Alas' says Maecenas 'that I did not die before Drusus'; and then 'discidio uellemque prius'—non omnia dixit | inciditque pudor quae prope dixit amor, | sed manifestus erat: moriens quaerebat amatae | coniugis amplexus oscula uerba manus. Even if the matrimonial fortunes of Maecenas were as completely unknown as they are unhappily notorious, could the context permit a doubt about the sense of *discidio*? It is translated 'our civil strife', with the note 'Maecenas recalls the hostilities between Octavian Caesar and Mark Antony'.

laud. Pis. 233 f. forsitan illius nemoris latuisset in umbra | quod canit (he might have stayed obscure in the shadow of that grove which he celebrates) 'his poem (illius quod canit?) might have lurked obscure in the shadow of the grove'.

Nem. cyn. 57 f. implicitumque sinu spinosi corporis erem | ferre domum (carry home the prickly hedgehog wrapped in one's bosom) 'the hedgehog entwined in the convolution of its prickly body'.

Auian. V 13 f. rusticus hunc (the ass in the lion's skin) magna postquam deprendit ab aure (having detected him by his length of ear) 'after catching him by his long ear'.

A singular fatality by which the editors are pursued is an impulse to

believe that sentences mean the opposite of what they do mean. Nem. cyn. 33 miratumque rudes se tollere Terea pinnas 'Tereus' wonderment that he could raise wings as yet untried'. Syr. 301 iratus etiam facinus consilium putat (the angry man thinks even a crime a sage proceeding) 'takes (hostile) intention as an actual deed'. 397 multorum calamitate uir moritur bonus (a good man's death is a misfortune to many) 'the affliction of many is death for the good man'. *el. in Maec.* I 28 num tibi non tutas fecit in urbe uias? (did he not enable you to walk the streets in safety?) 'did he make the streets of Rome unsafe for you?' Rutil. I 52 sospes nemo potest immemor esse tui (none enjoying safety can forget thee) 'none can be safe, if forgetful of thee'. Grammatical construction, and consequently sense, is again mistaken in *el. in Maec.* II 15 contingat and taceam, laud. Pis. 169 f. cum exultent, buc. Eins. I 12 damnato pignore, Repos. 2 flamma militat, Auian. III 3 hunc procedere, Rutil. I 5 (totiens) beatos quociens numerare possum.

In literary form the versions do not generally fall short of what it was reasonable to expect. Syrus is least adequately rendered, not so much because he is the best literature in the book as because of the difficulty inherent in rendering apophthegms.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

SEVENTY ODES OF HORACE TRANSLATED.

H. B. MAYOR: *Seventy Odes of Horace translated into English verse with notes and Latin text.* Pp. viii+247. Bristol: Arrowsmith, 1934. Cloth, 6s.

'THE lyrical parts of Horace,' said Dr. Johnson, 'never can be properly translated; so much of the excellence is in the numbers and the expression.' The learned Doctor has, as usual, hit the nail on the head; the difficulty of translating the *Odes* is to find suitable metres and to reproduce the author's 'incommunicable grace of expression.' A further difficulty is that, where it is necessary to reproduce the grouping of

verses in stanzas, the genius of English poetry seems to demand rhyme to bind the stanzas together and to prepare the reader for a fresh start after each quatrain. Rhymes are scarce in English and often involve the straining of the meaning of the original; indeed it is difficult not to agree with the late Professor Postgate (*Translation and Translations*, p. 96) that it is a needless luxury and a burden on the translator to do more than rhyme the second and last lines in each quatrain.

As regards metre, two alternatives seem to be open to the translator, either to choose an English metre suit-

able to each Latin metre and adhere to it always, or to choose for each ode the metre which seems best suited to the spirit of the poem. Mr. Mayor appears not to have made up his mind which course to adopt; e.g., in the twenty-nine alcaic odes which he has translated he uses the metre of Tennyson's *In Memoriam* for sixteen, and either short lines rhyming in pairs or quatrains with alternate rhymes for the rest.

The experiments which various translators have made in the actual reproduction of the original metres have hardly been successful, but it appears desirable to adhere to the general shape of the Latin stanza; for example, Conington's version of the sapphics of *Odes* III, 8, 1-4:—

The first of March! a man unwed!
What can these flowers, this censer mean?
Or what these embers, glowing red
On sods of green?

is much more like the original than Mr. Mayor's:—

Why this first of March, you wonder, is a
bachelor like me
All astrir, and making ready for domestic
revelry?
Flowers are here and myrrh and charcoal on
the new-cut sod aglow.

Mr. Mayor's versions, also, not seldom err on the side of a diffuseness which is quite alien to the 'sententious brevity' of Horace; for example, in II, 2 and III, 19 he takes six lines to render each quatrain. Occasionally too the metres chosen are quite unsuitable, e.g. in II, 18 and III 16.

But though Mr. Mayor's metres seem sometimes open to criticism, he is always scholarly and often happy in his versions. His rendering of I, 27 is particularly felicitous; and he certainly rises to the occasion in the six famous odes at the beginning of Book III.

The book is well produced, and readers will be grateful that the Latin text is given and English titles to each ode. EDWARD S. FORSTER.

University of Sheffield.

TUNES FOR HORACE.

- J. WAGNER: *Carmina Horatii selecta in usum iuventutis studiosae ad modos aptata*. Pp. 43; 40 pp. music. Budapest: I. Gottlieb, 1934. Paper, 3 pengő (about 3s.).

THE Hungarian Parthenon Society very fittingly celebrates the bimillenary of Horace by the issue of a collection of musical settings for his most popular lyrics, ranging from the tenth century to 1934. We commend this book to the amateur musician and scholar as an altogether delightful production. It is not meant for the professional metrist, since few of the composers had a notion of irrational syllables or cyclic dactyls; and some, like Dr. Fleming in his celebrated *Integer vitae*, make dreadful false quantities. Nor do we approach the question of the original manner of performance intended by Horace for his Odes. Here almost every style of vocal music is brought in. The first plain-song has no clef, but might be from c on the middle line (i.e. alto or viola clef). No. 2 is an unconvincing 'mensuralist' reconstruction of the mediaeval rhythm. Both these treat the Odes as

rhythmical prose more *Gregoriano*. But mostly we find harmonized settings in ordinary time. Often the trochaic metre is turned into 4-time: — ◡ becomes — ◡ or even — —; while — ◡◡◡ easily slips into a plain dactyl; and the difficulty of the irrational syllable (where modern experts mark an intolerable ♩ ♩ for — >) is conveniently shirked. More conscientious is the piece by Tritonius (No. 4) composed in 1507, where the halting but not ineffective rhythm recalls some modern transcriptions of Mesomedes. The same composer has some good cyclic dactyls in No. 5, but makes the irrational syllable short. In No. 10 *morum* is a misprint for *moram*. Simple and rather pleasing unison settings are 12 and 13 by Szabolcsi (1751-74.) B. Hahn (1785) turns three Odes into Mozartian songs with lively piano accompaniments—an experiment more amusing than praiseworthy. Some of the later compositions, like the editor's own, contain rich harmonies and counterpoint, which can only be judged by musicians and seem alien to the simplicity of a classical ode. But we need

not withhold our admiration from the last specimen, an old setting harmonized by Kodály in 1934. Many of these Odes might well be sung at school concerts and would make the study of Horace more attractive to some learners,

being a token of the devotion to the poet shown by his many admirers throughout the ages.

H. J. W. TILLYARD.

University College, Cardiff.

AFTER COMPARETTI.

J. W. SPARGO: *Virgil the Necromancer. Studies in Virgilian Legends.* (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, X.) Pp. vii+502; 29 illustrations on 27 plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1934. Cloth, \$5.00.

THIS most readable book is not an attempt to dethrone Comparetti's classical work, but rather seeks to supplement it by substituting facts and reasoned theories for somewhat vague guesses. Comparetti nowhere fairly faces and solves the problem of how it happened that Vergil, esteemed as poet and sage down to the end of antiquity, suddenly appears in the twelfth century as a magician, concerning whom all manner of folktales are told. That the gap is to be filled by postulating an otherwise unknown Neapolitan tradition is an untenable hypothesis, for why are no traces whatsoever of any such tradition to be found, say, in the ninth or tenth century? This excellent point Mr. Spargo makes in his last chapter, pointing out also that no Italian tells any of the tales of wizardry until some time after they have become current among northern Europeans. He himself is decidedly of opinion that some, notably the famous story of how Virgilius was hung in a basket, are of German origin. His method is to devote a chapter to each of the principal tales,—the talismans, the defence of Naples, the auto-

matic figures, the basket, the revenge on the unkind mistress, the Bocca della verità, the obelisk,—tracing each, so far as he can, to its oldest form, regularly seen to be quite unconnected with either the real or the legendary Vergil. The general result is that the legends are foreign and literary rather than Italian and popular.

Even if the text were worthless, which is very far from being the case, the mass of references to literature, often out-of-the-way, which fills pp. 317-450 and is followed by a reprint of a curious German poem from the unique copy at Munich, would deserve our gratitude. As a matter of fact, Mr. Spargo is not only an erudite but a very sensible man, cautious in his theorizing and often plainly correct in his suggestions.

Most of the points of disagreement which suggest themselves to the reviewer would be more fittingly discussed in a periodical dealing with folklore or mediaeval literature. Here, it suffices to mention that a few small slips occur in minor classical references, and that on pp. 83, 352, the difficulty of making sense out of Gervase of Tilbury arises from textual corruption. Gervase as we have him says Virgilius put all noxious reptiles out of the way *sub uiae sigillo*; but *sigillo* is here meaningless, therefore corrupt; perhaps *lapillo*.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

ITALIAN SELECTIONS FROM PROPERTIUS.

Properzio: *Elegie, scelte e commentate* da NICOLA TERZAGHI. Pp. 173. Naples: Perrella, 1933. Paper, L. 6.
Properzio: *Elegie scelte*, a cura di EMANUELE CESAREO. Pp. xxxi+77. Naples: Morano, 1933. Paper, L. 5.
THESE two school editions of Propertius

were published at Naples in 1933, as units of rival collections of classical authors. I must apologize to any English student who might be tempted to glance at either book for a delay of one year in reviewing them; but frankly I cannot see any reason why an English

student should be tempted. We have our excellent 'Selections' of Postgate and our new work-a-day edition by Butler and Barber, as well as the older commentaries from which the writers before us draw all that is of value in their own. Neither is equipped for textual criticism or research, and neither makes pretence of either. Each will serve to introduce Italian youths to some of Propertius's obvious beauties. Of the two, Terzaghi should be preferred, as offering a more interesting and representative selection of elegies. Cesareo chooses but one poem from the last book, and that *Feretrius*, which, in spite of a few fine lines, is the weakest by far of its contents. As a sample of his commentary I offer:—*illi uirgatis iaculantis ab agmine bracis* (IV. 10. 43):

'iaculantis (per *iaculanti*) genit. assol. alla greca.'

Cesareo prefaces his work with an appreciation of the poet; Terzaghi introduces each of his arbitrary groups, (for he follows no order of composition or division of books) with a statement of the background as he conceives it. But he simply repeats the old errors where any problem is presented. For instance:—*aurea Phoebi/porticus* a magno Caesare aperta fuit (II. xxxi.): 'Il portico di Apollo sul Palatino fu inaugurato da Ottaviano il 9 Ottobre del 28 a. C.' Suetonius says: *addidit porticus et bibliothecam*. It is incontrovertible that this poem dates from 24 B.C., when Augustus returned to Rome from Spain; but I have yet to meet the scholar who faces the fact, and its implications for the dates in Propertius.

As a specimen of commentary in difficulty I choose IV. 6. 15-18:

est Phoebi fugiens Athamana ad litora portus, qua sinus Ioniae murmura condit aquae,

Actia Iuleae pelagus monumenta carinae, nautarum uotis non operosa uia.

'Periodo assai complesso e contorto, dove la parte principale è accompagnata da tre apposizioni e da una proposizione con *qua*. Costr. *Pelagus est* (c'è una parte di mare) *portus fugiens ad Athamana litora Phoebi* (un porto . . .), *qua sinus condit* (dove un golfo raccoglie . . .) *murmura Ioniae aquae, Actia monumenta Iuleae carinae* (altra apposizione: monumento della vittoria Aziaca della flotta Giulia, ossia luogo dove la flotta Romana ha inalzato il monumento, od ha impresso il ricordo, della sua vittoria; *Iuleae*, per ragione metrica, considerato come un agg. derivante dal greco in *-eios*, e l'*I* iniziale è considerato come consonante), *non operosa uia uotis nautarum* (terza apposizione, cioè su cui i voti si compiono felicemente). Tutto questo serve a descrivere il luogo della battaglia.'

Except for the startling remark about the *I* of *Iuleae*, this note does little injustice to the received text. Yet it is mere acrobatics, and an extraordinary slight upon the intelligence and art of Propertius, which editor after editor hands on. A critic who cannot see that the second couplet belongs to the epilogue of the battle, which in the first couplet has not begun, should not be editing a classic. I use the word 'acrobatics' advisedly, because Terzaghi uses the phrase of my own work, which he actually once mentions, but does not seem to have examined. I agree that there is no reason why he should; the open sea is a dangerous place, and he has plenty of companions in the gulf, who cannot tell the difference in depth or width or noise.

O. L. RICHMOND.

University of Edinburgh.

THE LOEB VALERIUS FLACCUS.

Valerius Flaccus, with an English translation by J. H. MOZLEY, Lecturer in Classics in the University of London. Pp. xxi+458. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press), 1934. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

At last the Loeb series has furnished us with the first complete English translation of this difficult poet.

It is pleasant to find the translator acknowledging his gratitude for assistance to Professor W. C. Summers, who has done more in England than any scholar to rescue Valerius from ill-

deserved neglect; for his *Study of the Argonautica* (1894) is indispensable to the understanding of the poet. In his Introduction Mr. Mozley is, in fact, so close a follower of the scholarly work of his predecessor that he takes over even the latter's faulty references unchecked (p. xvii, n. 1: correct 2, 245 to 2, 304; 2, 574 to 2, 573; and 5, 252 to 5, 251). He knows too little about what has been done for Valerius beyond the work of recent editors and Dr. Summers, and an article or two in British periodicals. Had he read a useful paper in *Classical Philology* 25 (1930), pp. 328-42, by Professor R. B. Steele, entitled *The Interrelation of Latin Poets under Domitian*, he would have stressed the indebtedness of Silius to Valerius (p. xviii) more strongly than by saying with Dr. Summers that there are but a number of doubtful parallels. Had he known anything of the excellent work of Professor B. L. Ullman on Classical Authors in the Mediaeval Florilegia, he would not have astounded us by speaking on p. xix of 'some excerpts made in Paris in the thirteenth century' (the italics are mine).

The errors with which the text and translation swarm are legion, and it is possible only to hint at them here. The critical notes, where the names of Baehrens and Langen occur all too frequently, are enough to make us doubt the translator's ability to construct a text, as we may see from the adoption of bad suggestions like Peerkamp's *ecce autem* for *V's ecce leui* at 3, 257. It would have been better to reprint Giarratano with all his conservatism, or Kramer with all his devotion to Sudhaus. The translator must have sent to the printers a carelessly corrected text of Baehrens's edition, for in many cases one reading is given in the text and another is translated, as at 2, 440, where *uale* is printed and *mane* translated, the translation demanding also a strong stop after *missa*. There are at least nine other examples of this form of carelessness.

On p. xix the translator promises us a critical apparatus to show 'the divergences from *V* that involved any doubt as to the true reading,' and fulfils his promise by omitting many important

divergences from *V*; e.g. at 1, 356, where *V* reads *Crestus* but editors since Parrhasius *Piresius*. Too little attention is paid to Kramer's apparatus, which contains the best available reports of *V*, and no care has been taken to attribute emendations to their authors. Too much devotion is shown to Langen, as when his authority is invoked at 6, 143 to support *V*. And, in listing the later MSS. in a jumble of letters *MNOPQT* on pp. xix-xx, the translator does not tell us that *OPQ* are apographs of *S* and *MNT* of *V*, and he omits *X*, the most important of all the copies derived from *S*.

The defects which were noted by the reviewer of the translator's Loeb Statius again appear. We observe the same 'excessive literalness' and the same 'odd or even grotesque' qualities of the English. There are sentences of intolerable length, like the rendering of 1, 579-94. Often there is ambiguity, e.g. at 1, 447-8 *a quotiens famulo notis soror obvia silvis flevit* we have 'Ah! how often his sister, meeting him as a servant in her familiar woods, did weep.' Upwards of fifty words or phrases are omitted in the translation, and frequently we find additions to the Latin, the favourite being 'all,' which is unnecessary at 1, 52 and in at least fourteen other places. There are many amazing mistranslations: e.g. 1, 63 *externo* 'of strange lands' (although Professor Housman showed years ago how the word should be translated), 178 *fraternae* 'brother's' (instead of 'cousin's,' though right at 163), 792 *Furorum* 'the Furies'; 2, 447-8 *pars hinc levibus candentia velis castra levat* 'thereupon some raise light tents with the white sails'; 3, 495 'Alban' instead of 'Albanian'; 4, 230 *sacrae* 'sacred' instead of 'accursed'; 8, 121-2 *fluminis ora summa petunt* 'seeking the river's farthest bank,' 214 *nubiferam* 'with its pall of snow.' Explanatory notes are often defective, unnecessary, or inaccurate; a gross example is p. 8, n. 2 'Jason had once carried an old woman across the foaming torrent of the Euripus,' etc.

Misprints are not uncommon. In the text, the comma after 1, 145 should be deleted, 4, 65 *fontes* should be *montes*,

7, 275 *nomine* should be *nomina*. In the notes, on p. 136 read *totusque* for *torusque*, p. 170 *Eyssenhardt* for *Essenhardt*, p. 182 *gemitu* for *genitu*, p. 206 *Actna* for *Eina*. There are several others in the translation.

It is to be regretted that this volume,

the most pretentious British contribution so far to the study of Valerius, displays too much incompetence and carelessness to be of any real service to the study of an author who has been undeservedly neglected in this country.

ROBERT J. GETTY.

University of Liverpool.

TUSCULAN DISPUTATIONS.

M. Tulli Ciceronis *Tusculanarum Disputationum libri quinque*. A revised text with introduction and commentary and a collation of numerous MSS by the late T. W. DOUGAN and R. M. HENRY. Volume II, containing Books III-V. Pp. lv+308. Cambridge: University Press, 1934. Cloth, 21s.

ON Professor Dougan's death it was found that his commentary on Bk. III and on part of Bk. IV had been completed. This portion of the work has been published practically unaltered, and Professor Henry, using D.'s notebooks of MS readings, and himself collating ten additional MSS, is responsible for the rest. The plan of the volume is similar to that of D.'s edition of Bks. I and II (see *C.R.* XX, 119).

Henry's synopses of the contents of the books are models of clear statement and handy guides through the intricacies of these hastily written and at times rather haphazard discourses. (P. xii: on § 47, substitute 'virtue' for 'pleasure' in 'separates pleasure from the chief good.') In his disquisition on the 'sources,' H. argues sensibly for a Chrysippean source as the main authority for III and IV (our evidence not permitting dogmatic assertion for V), not, however, forgetting mildly to suggest that Cicero himself may well be given a little more credit for originality, both in the treatment of his sources and in his illustrations, than some would allow him.

Passing to the text and commentary, one is at once impressed with the formidableness of the *app. crit.* As some 30 or 40 MSS go to the making of it, and as these are never classed under group-symbols, the reports of their readings at any one passage may

often extend to a large number of lines, with the result that the essential facts are sometimes difficult to grasp. This is, however, inevitable owing to the necessity of keeping the *app. crit.* uniform with that of Vol. I, and whatever small drawbacks there may be in the plan, they are abundantly compensated by the mass of fresh information laboriously compiled, and presented here with meticulous care, for which all scholars must be grateful. Most of the important conjectures are mentioned and carefully weighed in the notes. One is, however, rather surprised that no use seems to have been made of the edition of Pohlenz. His conjectures are often at least worthy of mention. So far as I have detected, the present editors themselves contribute nothing that is absolutely new to the text, save two suggestions of Henry's. At V 33 he suggests, in his note, *sed si ita esset tum hoc . . . poneret* (*tum* was corrected in the archetype by *vel* (*ut*) *totum* and the gloss copied into the text after *tum*). At V 106 he reads *quam sit ea contemnenda secunda paulo ante dictum est*. This is a happy suggestion. His *secunda* gives excellent sense, and explains the corrupt *sicut a* or *sic uti*, which editors are usually content to bracket. No textual difficulty has been shirked, and the editors are always ready with sensible and cogent reasons for their choice of a reading.

The full commentary, to which wide reading, deep learning and common sense have contributed, will be a boon to everyone. The student of philosophy will rarely look in vain for full light on the many questions raised in these books, here illustrated by copious quotations from, and references to, all sorts of authors, Greek and Latin, early

and late; while the student of Latin-ity also will learn much. One or two small points call for criticism or suggestion. III 34 *praestari*: is not the derivation of *praestare*, transitive, *praes + sto* and not, as the note implies, *prae + sto*? IV 21: most students would have welcomed a note on the *κατηγορηματα*. IV 37, *excubat*: an exact parallel to *excubare animo* is to be found at Cic. Att. IX II, 4. IV 43 or 55: a reference to A.P. 102 (*si vis me flere* etc.) might be in place here to show that the Peripatetic view of the feelings proper in an orator had its parallel in those they demanded in a poet. IV 77, *fratres*: the metre of the first line at any rate is troch. tetr., not iamb.

octonarius, and the ictus mark on *impudentia* is impossible on either hypothesis.

But these *minutiae* in no way detract from the sterling qualities of this attractive and learned edition, and Professor Henry is to be thanked for giving to the world the maturest fruits of Dougan's scholarship and for his own solid contribution to the study of these difficult books—a contribution to which perhaps no higher compliment can be paid than by saying that it would be impossible to tell, unless the introduction informed us, at what point Henry shouldered the burden laid down by Dougan.

EDWARD J. WOOD.

University College, Aberystwyth.

AN ITALIAN COMMENTARY ON PETRONIUS.

ETTORE PARATORE: *Il Satyricon di Petronio*. Vol. I, Introduzione (pp. 214); II, Commento (pp. 446). Florence: Le Monnier, 1933. Stiff paper, L. 25.50.

THESE two large volumes consist of an elaborate introduction to Petronius and an extensive running commentary on each chapter (nowhere referred to by sections). The text is not included, and there is no preface, bibliography or index—or rather there is an index, as follows: 'Cap. I . . . pag. 1, II . . . 11, III . . . 14,' and so on! This makes it quite impossible to find the author's views on any particular question, though they are often scattered in five or six different places; as he quotes hundreds of books and articles, it is more often than not impossible to know what *op. cit.* refers to. Had the book been adequately indexed, it would have been an invaluable repository of information on Petronian studies, for the author has the excellent habit of giving fully the views of his predecessors (though he scarcely ever refers to any English or American scholar, and the work of Heraeus receives far less than its due): as it is, the 660 closely packed pages are like an uncharted sea, in which the information one is seeking may be floating about anywhere.

Chapter I of the introduction deals with the external circumstances of the

composition; Chapter II with its place in ancient narrative literature, containing a suggestive study of the spirit and background of the literature of the Empire. Chapter III deals with the probable length and contents of the original text. The fragments do not necessitate the view that our Petronius is but a small fraction of the whole, which may have been in one volume of perhaps six books: no credit is given to ancient references to books 14-16. [Yet Apuleius has 11 books, Sisenna had at least 13—and the age of Silius and Lucan was no stranger to prolixity.] It is refreshing to find Paratore sceptical as to the corrupting influence of the mysterious epitomator.

The author is at his best in criticizing his predecessors and playing off one against another, but the data are too few, and his own reconstruction seems none too plausible. All depends on what happened at Marseilles. According to Paratore there was a pestilence, and to get one year's free entertainment, Encolpius offered himself as *φάρμακός*—which assumes that the citizens would have to bear the pestilence a whole year longer! The brilliantly clever reconstruction of Cichorius (*Römische Studien*, 438 ff.) is not even mentioned.

With reference to the other crucial point, it is surely quite out of keeping with Petronius' ironic and bantering

tone to take Encolpius' *occidi hominem* as a serious confession of murder for petty gain.

Chapter IV examines various identifications of the *urbs graeca*, and finds all untenable: no particular town is meant.

The commentary consists mainly of minutely elaborate literary criticism, or rather appreciatory exposition of each chapter, almost each sentence. The writer is a whole-hearted admirer, and it is good to be reminded of the innumerable happy touches which one overlooks on a cursory reading. Indeed it is not likely that the hand which gave us the conversation at Trimalchio's dinner-party should have fallen into mediocrity in the rest of the book, as seems to be the usual view. Take the

happy description of 109, 6-7 as a 'manierato pezzo di bravura' with its 'banalità convenzionale ed oleografica': it is an ironic exercise in rhetoric, a precursor of Longus and the Second Sophistic, yet with poetic touches (as in the artificialities of Sannazaro or Marino).

Still there are too many ecstatic superlatives, and points of scholarship are only incidentally dealt with, and not always happily: when tested in some thirty passages of known difficulty the book was helpful only in a very few cases. Yet it is encumbered with such remarks as this on *coda*—'interessantissimo neologismo plebeo per cauda.'

W. B. SEDGWICK.

Wyggeston School, Leicester.

EPOCHS OF ROMAN HISTORY.

FRANZ ALTHEIM: *Epochen der römischen Geschichte von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn der Weltherrschaft*. Pp. 248. Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann, 1934. Paper, RM. 8.50 (bound, 10.50).

ALTHEIM'S choice of a title is to be understood as implying a specific idea of history in general and of Roman history in particular: of history in general, as consisting of a series of significant, creative moments, separated by intervals of waiting or even stagnation; and of Roman history, as distinguished from pre-history by conscious and fructifying contact with Hellenism, the effect of which was to elicit the native genius of Rome. He begins with a sketch of Italy in its geographical, ethnical and cultural variety, within which he finds constantly at work a principle of unification—corresponding to that which for France is expressed in the saying *La Gaule fait les Gaulois*. Of this Italian world, Rome at first is a comparatively unimportant member, but from the very beginnings of her tradition certain characteristic and unique tendencies are already traceable: in particular, the idea of the state as bringing into subjection to itself the institutions of the racial, clan and family groups out of which it grew. This idea he finds at work, for instance, in the curiate system even in its most primi-

tive stages, as well as in the decemviral code and throughout the Conflict of the Orders. His exposition of the political side of the development is on the whole conservative, assigning more value to the ideas of first-century writers than is customary with 'evolutionist' critics. On the other hand, he shows originality and sometimes audacity in the use of the evidence from philology and from cult. In this connection, he has a remarkable passage (p. 61) on the reception of Greek cults in Italy, stating what he says is the modern view—*Dass Götter nicht Geschöpfe ihrer Verehrer sind, sondern seiende Mächte . . . dass sie Realitäten darstellen, die nicht erfunden sondern als existent befunden und erkannt werden*: Dionysos Eleutheros as Liber, Demeter as Ceres, were not only real to the Italians who received them, they were realities in themselves.

Among the 'epochs' which Altheim specially emphasizes as significant for his purpose are the reception of these two divinities, along with Libera, in 496—the first direct contact between Rome and Hellenism, not mediated by the Etruscans; the Gallic inroad, which interrupted such contact for nearly a century, while Rome was making herself mistress, by her own characteristic methods, of middle Italy; and the renewal of intercourse at and after the

Pyrrhic war—one of whose most pregnant consequences was the arrival of Livius Andronicus, whom members of the governing class employed of de-

liberate policy to provide Rome with a literature of her own.

A. F. GILES.

University of Edinburgh.

ANCIENT ROADS.

R. J. FORBES: *Notes on the History of Ancient Roads and their Construction*. Pp. xi and 182, with 3 appendices and 35 illustrations. (Amsterdam University, Allard Pierson Stichting, Archaeologisch-Historische Bijdragen iii.) Amsterdam: Nord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-mij, 1934.

THIS book is meant, the author tells us, to sketch the outline rather than to give a complete survey of the history of road-making: and, in fact, after explaining the origins, partly economic, partly religious, of the roads, he discusses their constructional details and maintenance in the prehistoric West, in the early civilized areas of the East, and finally in Greece and in the Roman Empire. Much of this hardly enters into the scope of this journal, but we may mention the author's useful survey of the 'log-roads' of Holland, where a technique of construction originating in the early bronze age maintained itself under the Roman Empire, and of the tramway-tracks which are found—among other places—in prehistoric Malta and in Greece. Much space is devoted to discussing the development of the road-net in Greece and the Roman Empire, and upon the history of road-administration. But on its historical side the work is generally amateurish and shows little evidence of detailed research. Its importance lies principally in the fact that the author is himself a road-engineer who has actually built roads. The technical details concern, of course, mainly Roman roads, because there are few 'made roads' which are certainly earlier and of which adequate sectional drawings exist. The author starts, as Bergier started, from Vitruvius vii. 1, and interprets the archaeological material in the light of it, being care-

ful, however, to notice local deviations from the ideal scheme. In this there is little that calls for criticism, though the author has not always been on his guard to distinguish the later make-up of a road from the layers of its original construction (see figure 35). The Roman road, he maintains, for all its heavy mass—and in some degree because of it—lacked the plasticity of a modern road; it was more likely to disintegrate under the stress of weather or of subsoil changes, and minor repairs could not easily be effected upon the surface of it. The author does not believe that the efficient life of a Roman road was more than 30-40 years.

There are a good many statements of history and prehistory that one might query. It is quite unproven, for instance, that a Celtic road was used as the foundation of any Roman road in Britain, even Watling Street (p. 31); the Fosse-Way is not a ridge-way (p. 27); and there is nothing in Déchelette, at least, about hoards of tin bars in Gaul. But it is not the historical side of the work which is important. On the technical side, one would have liked a more extensive use of mile-stones to show how often Roman roads actually were repaired (certain roads in Spain are alone discussed in this respect), and one would have liked to know what a road-engineer thought of the central gully at Blackstone Edge.

Finally, one must beg the author when he writes his next book to give page-references to the modern authorities whom he cites. The flesh grows weary with tracking a reference to 'Cox' (and nothing more) when 'Cox' has written a book 400 pages long.

C. E. STEVENS.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

SOME CLASS-BOOKS.

A First Latin Course. By A. S. C. BARNARD. Pp. viii+136. London: Bell, 1934. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

Latin for Today. By MASON D. GRAY and THORNTON JENKINS. Book One, edited by CUTHBERT McEVoy. Pp. xxxii+254. Book Two, edited by CUTHBERT McEVoy and F. DALE. Pp. xvi+344. Book Three, edited by F. DALE. Pp. ix+298. London: Ginn. Cloth, 3s., 3s. 6d., 3s. 6d.

IN most modern schools the study of Latin is having to fight for its foothold. Time is scanty and other claims are insistent. Teachers are unwilling to sacrifice anything of thoroughness, but the study must be made interesting and must carry the maximum of historical and cultural as well as linguistic value for pupils who may go no further than the School Certificate Examination. Hence the regiment of 'Courses' now appearing. Hence also their virtues and, even more obviously, their vices: the former an increased compactness of grammatical information and abundance of historical and other material; the latter an effort to be lively at all costs, leading to the adoption of a bright classroom manner ill suited to a textbook which will be used for regular study.

The first of the books under notice, Mr. Barnard's *First Latin Course*, is intended for young pupils. Its best points are the carefully graduated time and space allotted to the new rules as they occur, and the comparative abundance of vocabulary and reading matter; the worst are the unnaturalness of many of the English examples ('with great boldness the high mountain will be climbed'), and the conversational, if not patronising, style of the explanations.

Latin for Today is a serious and coherent attempt so to modify the method of Latin teaching as to increase its aesthetic and imaginative value while retaining its traditional soundness. The editors build on the foundations laid by Mr. Mason Gray in his *Teaching of Latin*. The chief principles invoked are those of connected reading from the outset, and of a more natural

approach to the understanding of Latin passages through the natural Latin order of words and through intelligent guesswork. Most practical teachers of the modern school will find themselves in sympathy with these ideas and already familiar with their practice. They will also readily agree with the careful emphasis laid on English derivatives. But they may have less liking for the lengthy and conversational explanations and the excessive prompting of the master with suitable questions and exercises for the class. Here again we have the tendency to confuse the qualities of a textbook for pupils and a handbook for teachers.

The reading matter is excellent, covering considerable fields of Roman history and social life (in Book III this consists of extracts from Caesar), and is enhanced in value by good maps and illustrations, and such diversions as the late Mr. Godley's pleasant Latin fooling on the Motor Bus. The course covers three years, and should leave the pupil equipped with a useful vocabulary, a sound grasp of syntax, and some knowledge of Roman life. It remains a question whether all this elaboration, and over a thousand printed pages, are wanted to achieve this end.

Foundations for Greek Prose Composition.

By L. W. P. LEWIS and L. M. STYLER. Pp. x+251. London: Heinemann, 1934. Cloth, 4s.

THIS is an excellent book. It is designed as a companion to Messrs. Lewis and Goddard's *Foundations for Latin Prose Composition*, and it has the same qualities of accurate scholarship, clear grasp of the essential problems of the student, and freshness of approach. The introduction to continuous prose is admirable. In it the student is rapidly introduced to the essential principles of thought and style which underlie Greek prose, and at the same time to some universal elements of language and expression. Both sentences and longer passages are varied and often pleasantly unconventional. The vocabulary throughout is uncommonly copious. The book is simple enough for young

students but scholarly enough for the older or more advanced.

H. LISTER.

Selhurst Grammar School.

Latin Fundamentals. By E. L. HET-
TICH and A. G. C. MAITLAND.
Revised edition. Pp. xvi+389. New
York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1934.
Cloth, \$2.25.

Latin Prose Composition. By R. D.
WORMALD. Pp. 376. London: Ar-
nold. Cloth, 4s. 6d.

Sensim, Book III. By R. D. WORMALD.
Pp. 160. London: Arnold, 1934.
Cloth, 3s.

The Fourth Book of Virgil's Aeneid.
Edited by H. E. BUTLER. Pp. v+91.
Oxford: Blackwell, 1935. Cloth,
2s. 6d.

HERE is a small handful of school-books, typical in their different ways of the better modern publications in this kind. Clear thinking about ends and means is the mark of a good school-book: and an author or editor may reasonably be expected to have gauged the conditions and needs of a definite class of intended readers. Mr. Wormald satisfies this requirement blamelessly: his *Latin Prose Composition* is meant for boys who have learnt the first stages—say two years of a normal course, or one year of a brisk one—and from that point it conducts them, by a process that may be described as resembling a more elementary and up-to-date Bradley's Arnold, to a good School Certificate level. Within these limits, the method is traditional and the Latinity

for the most part soundly based. *Sensim*, Book III continues a systematic course in unseen translation into the regions of the Higher Certificate. Its passages, of which the later sections are derived from papers actually set, progress by reasonable stages, mixing prose and verse and including not too many familiar pieces.

We have learned in recent years to expect much of America in pedagogical method: but it has to be admitted that it is hard to see exactly for whom *Latin Fundamentals* is designed. It is excellently laid out, beautifully printed and exact in details: but for a beginner it is too ponderous and too terminological, for a revising senior it surely advances too slowly. Psychological approach seems to be sacrificed to traditional grammatical order. And, since the paradigms are tabulated in blocks when they first appear, it seems wasteful of space to repeat them as an appendix. This edition, which is a revision of an earlier work, now contains part of the Sixth Book of the *Gallie War*.

Lastly, Professor Butler's edition of *Aeneid IV* has a clear purpose, which is not primarily the teaching of grammar by means of Virgil, but the interpretation of Virgil and his story for a reader capable of taking most of the grammar for granted. It goes without saying that it is a scholarly edition, commendably concise. Perhaps the pages of text present a slightly crowded appearance compared with the bold type of introduction and notes.

C. W. BATY.

The King's School, Chester.

Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. United States of America. Providence: Museum of the Rhode Island School of Design. Fascicule 1, by Stephen Bleecker LUCE. Pp. 49; 31 plates. Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1933. Cloth and boards, 20s.

THIS fascicule of the C.V.A. contains Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Cypriote, Helladic, Greek, Etruscan and Roman vases. There are interesting pieces by the Phineus painter, Nikosthenes painter, Olto, Epiktetos, Makron, Providence painter, Brygos painter, and Villa Giulia painter. The illustrations are on the whole good, although space might with advantage have been saved on the less interesting vases, so as to give more room for details, e.g.

of the geometric *olpe*. The bibliographies at the beginning of the sections and to the particular vases have some curious omissions, e.g. Price, *Classification of East Greek Pottery*, and all works by Beazley on Black Figure after the *Sketch*: the b.f. neck amphora, pl. 9. 1, is published by Jacobsthal, *Ornamente*, pl. XIX a, b, and now by Beazley, *B.S.A.*, XXXII, p. 11 (painter of Louvre F. 51). The Danae *lekythos*, pl. 17. 2, is published by Beazley, *J.H.S.* 1927, p. 232. The descriptions of the vases might well have contained approximate dates and attributions to groups of like vases, e.g. in Corinthian, references to similar vases in Payne *N.C.* (and the *lekythos*, pl. 12. 1, is very near the Antimenes painter). Some of the attributions of black ware, etc., to Italy and Athens are

doubtful. Why, for instance, should the little *lekkythos*, pl. 30. 5, be called Apulian?

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University of Manchester.

W. AREND: *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer*.

Pp. x + 162. (Problemata, Heft 7.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1933. Paper, RM. 12.

THE problem of repetitions is fundamental to the Homeric question, and Arend has performed a useful function by his close analysis of those types of scene which Homer describes more than once in much the same words. The bulk of the book is occupied with a description and discussion of such typical scenes and guides us conscientiously through messengers, meals, dreams, putting to sea, putting on armour, putting on clothes, etc. The progress is, naturally enough, not very lively, and few will read the book for pleasure. But it is certainly useful to have such scenes classified and analysed in detail, if only because they show how Homer differs on the one side from primitive epics and on the other side from Vergil and his later imitators. In the degree both of his repetitions and of the variations which he makes in them Homer stands midway between the primitive and the literary epic. It is a pity that Arend, who is well read in the appropriate literatures, has not drawn his conclusions more emphatically or faced more boldly the lessons to be learned from epics more advanced than the *Epic of Gilgamesh* and less literary than the *Orlando Furioso*. His most interesting chapter is his first, where he surveys the problem and makes some important remarks about it. All students of Homer should read this, if they wish to see how vital this aspect of the Homeric question is and how often it has been misunderstood. The other chapters are useful for reference, and there are excellent indices.

C. M. BOWRA.

Wadham College, Oxford.

F. DORNSEIFF: *Nochmals der homerische Apollonhymnos*. (Greifswalder Beiträge, Heft 8). Pp. 19. Greifswald: H. Dallmeyer, 1934. Paper.

IN this pamphlet Dornseiff attempts to answer some criticisms of his book *Die archaische Mythenerzählung*, reviewed in *C.R.* xlviii p. 61. His paradoxes caused some surprise among his more serious countrymen, and he is pained and worried by this unfriendly reception. His answers are more amusing than satisfactory, and very little is added to our knowledge of the subject.

C. M. BOWRA.

Wadham College, Oxford.

Xenophontis *Commentarii*. Recensuit K. HUDE. Editio maior. Pp. vi + 195. Leipzig: Teubner, 1934. Paper, RM. 3.80 (bound. 4.80).

SO far as concerns MSS., Hude has left nothing for future editors to do. He has filled up a big gap by collating the six Italian MSS., so that at last we have a complete knowledge of the two *Marctiani* (MO). Even the three fifteenth-century *Vaticani* have yielded more of value than could have been expected. One of the

latter (Z) turns out to be of importance in III, IV, because in I, II it often agrees with the best MS. (A), which contains only these books. Therefore Z's *ταῦτα* (for *ταῖν*, or *om.*) *αὐτοῦς ἡμῖν συνεργεῖν* (IV. iii, 12), *ὁμοίας* (for *ὁμοίως* IV. viii, 10), and the previously known *ἄλλους* . . . *ἀμαρτάνοντας* (*ib.* 11) may well be right. But the best contribution of Z is *εὐτακτοτέρους* for *πρακτικωτέρους* at IV, v, 1, for this disposes of a serious difficulty.¹

Other new and good readings stand to the credit of the Italian MSS., e.g. *ἀ μέν . . . ἀ δέ* (for *τὰ μέν . . . τὰ δέ* I. i, 4); *διώκει* (previously conjectured for *διώκει* II. i, 34), *τέκνα γένονται* (for *γένονται* II. ii, 4), *οἶμα προσήκειν καὶ τοῦτ'* (III. iv, 9), and *νομίζει* (for *νομίζει* *ib.*, 14).

Another improvement in the text is the increased importance attributed to the MSS. of Stobaeus.

At III. ix, 4 I regret to see that H. has printed *σοφούς τε καὶ ἐγκρατεῖς* followed by *ἀσόφους τε καὶ ἀκρατεῖς*, for Delatte seems to have proved that *ἀκρατεῖς* and *ἐγκρατεῖς* should change places.

H.'s conjectures are very good, and of course he is right in restoring the explanatory *γὰρ* after *ἀγαπητῇ μὲν* with A. It. Stob. at II. i, 32.

There are a good many minor misprints.

E. C. MARCHANT.

Lincoln College, Oxford.

EIKOTA: *Emendationen und Interpretationen zu griechischen Prosaikern der Kaiserzeit*. Von ALBERT WIFSTRAND. III. *Lese Früchte zu verschiedenen Schriftstellern*. Pp. 31. *Bemerkungen zu Dion von Prusa*. Von TAGE CHRISTOFFERSSON. Pp. 33. (Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund, 1933-4, IV, 1933-4, III.) Lund: Gleerup.

DR. WIFSTRAND continues to deserve well of the late Greek prose writers (cf. *C.R.* XLVII, p. 246), and to show how much can be done for them by clear thought and simple critical expedients. His present notes concern Dio Chrysostom, Lucian, [Longinus], Hephaestion, Philostratus (*vit. Ap.*), Julian, Libanius, and (in a note on pp. 8 f.) Porphyry (*in Ptolem. Harm.*), and his defences and emendations of the text of these authors will deserve careful consideration by their editors in future. The most generally interesting note is on Dio XXXI 14, where *παρὰ τοῖς νόμοις* is retained, and the uses of *παρὰ* with a non-personal dative in late Greek are classified.

Dr. Wifstrand edits in the same series some notes on Dio left by the late Tage Christoffersson. They consist chiefly of a defence of the unity of *or.* XII against Lemarchand's hypothesis (*Rev. de Philol.* 1929, pp. 20 ff.) that it is a combination of several versions; Christoffersson successfully shows that L. demands a degree of logical consistency in Dio which we have no right to expect and Dio himself disclaims.

¹ *ψυχῇ*, *ῥ* (IV. iii, 14) is credited to Z in the preface, but to Y in the *n. cr.*; anyhow it is not peculiar to either.

There follow some sensible textual notes and a useful conspectus of the most common forms of asyndeton in Dio. In the note on IV 52 (adverbs of place *where* for adverbs of place *whither* in late Greek) reference might be made to Headlam on Herodas I 6 (Knox-Headlam, p. 14), and the note on XII 2 (*καὶ δὲ* retained in the sense of *καὶ δὲ καὶ*) might be supplemented by Denniston, *Greek Particles*, p. 249, who gives examples of this use in Attic as early as Plato.

W. HAMILTON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

Greek Geography. By E. H. WARMINGTON. Pp. xlviii + 269. London and Toronto: Dent, 1934. Cloth, 5s. net.

THIS is a volume of 'The Library of Greek Thought,' of which Dr. Ernest Barker is general editor. It contains in English translation the geographical passages in classical writers, grouped under four main headings: Cosmology, including the older ideas about climatology, geology and physical geography, and the dawn of scientific geography in general; Climatology and physical and political geography; Exploration and the descriptive geography resulting from it; and Mathematical geography with cartography. Of these the third is of course by far the largest, and the growth of knowledge is illustrated by quoting each author in historical order, whatever topics he may treat: an arrangement which makes references easy to find, but at some cost to the coherence of the outlines of Greek knowledge. Mr. Warmington intersperses his own comments and topographical identifications, and saves space by excising picturesque but un-geographical detail. Occasionally this makes

a passage almost unintelligible, e.g. the account of the Laestrygonian herdsmen, *Od.* x. 82 (p. 68); and in *Il.* xiii. 3-6 (p. 69) 'the Abii also, most righteous men' makes two people out of one, though the translation 'resourceless men' for ἀβιοί is given in a note. The 'most important passages of Plato and Aristotle on geology and climatology' are represented by references only (pp. 29-30).

It is not clear what classes of readers are expected; but anyone not well acquainted with Greek, but interested in the history of geography, will find the book indispensable; and Mr. Warmington's introduction brings out the main features of ancient geographical thought and experience, and the conditions, geographical and historical, which made these as partial and inconclusive as they were.

J. L. MYRES.

New College, Oxford.

E. RENAN: *Prière sur l'Acropole*, with readings from the original MS., edited by E. VINAVER and T. B. L. WEBSTER. Pp. 45. Manchester: University Press, 1934. Paper, 2s.

THOUGH drenched with that peculiar sentimentality which has the flavour of sweet champagne, Renan's *Prière* is still well worth reading as an appreciation and a criticism of Hellenism. This edition can be recommended to students both of the classics and of modern languages. Its *variae lectiones* incidentally provide a study in style, and the reader is helped by admirable introductions from Professors Webster and Vinaver, the latter of which shows how far Renan was from the candour which he admired in the Greeks.

R. W. LIVINGSTONE.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

(A reference to *C.R.* denotes a notice already published in the *Classical Review*.)

CLASSICAL WEEKLY.

VOL. XXVIII, NOS. 11-16. JANUARY-FEBRUARY, 1935.

C. Knapp, *Hogs Roman and Modern: Boar Hunting, Ancient and Modern.* Id., *The Cena Trimalchionis of Petronius illustrated by a Story in the Saturday Evening Post.* H. C. Montgomery, *Julius Caesar and the Sectio Caesarea.* M. Reinhold, *A Note on the Legislation concerning Roman Crematories.* Id., *The Imperial Commentarii Aquarum.* V. B. Schuman, *The Origin of the Expression *ἐν τῷ αἰσέ* used in the Papyri.* Officials had to guess the ages of persons who did not know their own ages. J. P. Pritchard, *Some American Estimates of Horace.* Opinions of prominent authors. E. Fitch, *Aeschylus the Dramatist.* Would answer Farnell, *J.H.S.* 1933, 40 by saying that Prometheus' error is in being persistently implacable, in exalting righteous indignation above an ordered conduct of affairs. A. W. Milden, *Greek and the Teacher of Latin.* E.

Riess, *Religious Gleanings from the Magical Papyri.* These documents show the usual syncretism of Greek gods (no longer departmental) and Hebrew and Egyptian elements, a recrudescence of primitive religious ideas, a frequent desire for union (*σύνταξις*) with the god: they may contain pieces of actual cult ritual. W. H. Alexander, Seneca, *de Vita Beata* 19. 3. Punctuate at *maledici in alienam contumeliam, venusti sunt. crederem illis hoc vacare.* S. probably wrote *concederem.* C. M. Hall, *Some Epicureans at Rome.* Mostly the personalities mentioned by Cicero. A. M. Young, *The Stoic Creed on the Origin of Kingship and of Laws.* Their evolution in connection with the theory of the fall from the Golden Age: the natural kingship of the wise man. The Epicurean view is quite different. F. C. Babbitt, *Thucydides I 27. 1, πενήκοινα δραχμάς καθάπερ Κορινθίους μένειν* has nothing to do with Corinthian drachmae but means 'stay in Corinthian territory.' T. B. Jones, *Alexander and the Winter of 330-329 B.C.* Probably wintered in Seistan and reached the Hindu Kush in March. J. W.

Spaeth Jr., *A Floating Island in the Nile*. Mela I 52. Various writers give modern illustrations for a long-lived pear-tree (Virg. *Ecl.* 9. 50), the decline of oratory (Tac. *Dial.* 11), leaves as supplementary fodder (Cato *De Agri Cultura* 54 etc.), werewolves (Petron. 61). *Classical Articles in Non-Classical Periodicals* VII-IX.

REVIEWS.—G. E. Duckworth, *Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius, and Vergil*, Princeton, 1933. Excellent dissertation (S. E. Bassett). I. A. Richmond, *The City Wall of Imperial Rome*, Oxford, 1930. Favourable (A. D. Fraser). A. W. Gomme, *The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1933. Discussed by M. I. Finkelstein. *Corinth, Results of Excavations. Vol. VIII, Part 1, Greek Inscriptions*, edited by B. D. Meritt, Harvard, 1931. *Vol. IX, Sculpture*, by F. P. Johnson, 1931. *Vol. IV, Part 1, Decorated Terracottas*, by Ida Thallon-Hill and Lida Shaw King, 1929. Summaries by A. D. Fraser. C. A. Robinson Jr., *The Ephemerides of Alexander's Expedition*, Providence, 1932. Favourable (T. B. Jones). R. E. Dickinson and O. J. R. Howarth, *The Making of Geography*, Oxford, 1933. Favourable (W. W. Hyde).

GNOMON.

XI. I. JANUARY, 1935.

F. Schulz: *Prinzipien des römischen Rechts* [Munich: Duncker und Humblot, 1934. Pp. xi+188] (Gelzer). Of use to non-specialists, but not faultless. F. M. Cornford: *The Origin of Attic Comedy* [C.R. XLIX. 14] (Zieliński). Interesting but hardly convincing. *Papyri and Altertumswissenschaft*. Ed. W. Otto und L. Wenger [Munich: Beck, 1934. Pp. x+476, 1 illustration, 3 maps] (Schubart). Illustrates the width of papyrological studies, but does less than justice to their methods and difficulties. K. Regling: *Münzkunde* [C.R. XLVII. 18] (Schwabacher). An indispensable guide to the study of coins. H. P. L'Orange: *Studien zur Geschichte des spätantiken Porträts* [Oslo: Aschehoug, 1933. Pp. 157, 218 illustrations 4°] (Lippold). Necessarily inconclusive, but a valuable collection of material. R. Delbrück: *Spätantike Kaiserporträts* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1933. Pp. xix+252, 80 illustrations, 128 plates 4°] (Sieveking). Thorough and industrious, though S. disagrees on many points of detail. M. Iulli *Ciceronis Tusc. Disp.* vol. II. Ed. T. W. Dougan and R. M. Henry [Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1934. Pp. lv+308] (Pohlenz). Continuing a first volume published 30 years ago, it has much that is out of date, but there is useful matter in the commentary. *Aetna*: ed. E. Schwartz [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1933. Pp. 34] (Köstermann). K. reviews in detail and approves in general. *St. Augustin*: five recent books are noticed briefly by W. Theiler. F. Buecheler: *Kleine Schriften* vol. 3 [C.R. XLVII. 43] (Jachmann). The edition deserves our gratitude. A. W. Persson: *Eisen und Eisenbereitung in ältester Zeit* [Lund: Gleerup,

1934. Pp. 17] (Kirsten). The work impinges on several highly specialized studies. R. Cohen: *La Grèce et l'Hellénisation du monde antique* [Paris: Les Presses Univ. de France, 1934. Pp. xlv+657] (Hoffmann). Not original work, but a useful introduction and summary. M. Gude: *A History of Olynthus* [C.R. XLVIII. 147] (Hampl). In spite of mistakes and omissions the book will be an aid to future research. C. A. Robinson: *The Ephemerides of Alexander's Expedition* [C.R. XLVI. 216] (Berve). A very unsound thesis. C. Möller: *Vom Chorlied bei Euripides* [Diss. Göttingen, 1933. Pp. v+87] (Nestle). Unscholarly and useless. F. Sauter: *Der römische Kaiserkult bei Martial und Statius* [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934. Pp. ix+178] (Rose). R. is in general agreement but points out some mistaken opinions. W. Felgentraeger: *Antikes Lösungsrecht* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1933. Pp. 133] (Weber). Of great value for students of ancient law. *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, vols. 8, 9, 10, 11 [Rome: American Academy, 1930-3] (Matz). M. gives a favourable account of a few of the more important papers. R. Pfeiffer: *Humanitas Erasmi* [Leipzig: Teubner, 1931. Pp. viii+24] (Hartmann). *Bibliotheca Philologica Classica*, vols. 58-9 ed. W. Rehnitz [Leipzig: Reissland, 1934] (Geissler).

XI. 2. FEBRUARY, 1935.

Fouilles de Delphes. Vol. II: Topographie et Architecture, Le Trésor des Athéniens by J. Audiat [Paris: Boccard, 1933. Pp. 109, profusely illustrated] (Schleif). Sch. disagrees about the date, but admits that this in no way lessens the value of the book. P. Ducati: *Pontische Vasen* [C.R. XLVIII. 71] (Mingazzini). A complete and well-documented book which attempts to classify as well as to describe. *Die hellenistische Kunst in Pompeji*, vol. 5: *Hellenistische Tische etc.* by E. Pernice [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1932. Pp. 99, 57 plates 4°] (Ippel). A very fine piece of work of which the true merit can only be realized by those who know Pompeii and its difficulties. M. Rostovtzeff: *Caravan Cities* [C.R. XLVII. 129] (Schlumberger). Sch. gives his own views at some length. R. Schütz: *Die Offenbarung des Johannes und Kaiser Domitian* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1933. Pp. 67, 4 illustrations] (Meyer). A learned book, not without value even if the conclusions are untenable. G. van der Leeuw: *Phänomenologie der Religion* [Tübingen: Mohr, 1933. Pp. xii+669] (Harder). An impressive book. H. Meyer: *Hymnische Stilelemente in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* [C.R. XLVIII. 191] (Snell). An interesting theory. *Inscriptiones Italiae*. Vol. XI, Regio XI, Fasc. I: *Augusta Praetoria* ed. P. Barocelli, Fasc. II: *Eporedia* ed. J. Corradi [C.R. XLVII. 186] (Stein). St. would welcome the more speedy publication of less elaborately documented volumes of this important work. A. Schmitt: *Das Bild als Stilmittel Frontos* [Diss. Munich: Salesianische Offizin, 1934. Pp. 126] (Haffter). A good and sympathetic book which will make readers think again about a much-abused author.—P. Maas

reproduces and comments on the best preserved parts of the new Euphron. K. Deichgräber (general editor) reports on the progress of the *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*.—Bibliographical Supplement 1935, No. 1 (down to Jan. 31).

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(OCTOBER, 1934—JANUARY, 1935.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—K. Holzinger, *Erklärung umstrittener Stellen des Aristophanes*. II. S.-B. d. Wien. Ak. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl., Bd. 215, Abh. 1 [Vienna, 1933, Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky. Pp. 73] (E. Wüst). Contains many real textual improvements.—I. C. A. M. Bongenaar, *Isokrates' Trapeziticus* [C.R. XLVIII, 193] (A. Kraemer). Text mainly follows Drerup, with Dutch translation opposite. Very serviceable commentary with plausible linguistic observations on alternative readings. Four noteworthy appendices and a careful index.—W. Arend, *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer* [Berlin, 1933, Weidmann. Pp. 162] (S. Lorenz). Examines in detail the formulae, with their variations, for typical scenes such as arrival, sacrifice, arming, sleep, etc. Careful work.—P. C. van der Horst, *Les vers d'or Pythagoriciens* [Leiden, 1932. Pp. xlii+76] (W. Nestle). Detailed introduction, text, full and valuable commentary, to which reviewer suggests a few additions.—J. Tkatsch, *Die arabische Uebersetzung der Poetik des Aristoteles und die Grundlage der Kritik des griechischen Textes*. Bd. 2. Herausg. von A. Gudeman und T. Seif [Vienna, 1932, Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky. Pp. 237] (A. Gudeman). Most thorough and methodically exemplary work. Inaugurates a new epoch in criticism of text of Poetics, and finally destroys the 'Apographa' hypothesis that has held the field for the last seventy years. Cannot be neglected by anyone working on the Poetics.—A. Wifstrand, *Von Kallimachos zu Nonnos* [C.R. XLVIII, 148] (P. E. Sonnenburg). Greater part deals with development of hexameter (Part I) and stylistic observations (Part II). Solid, devoted work, full of matter.—F. Schwenn, *Die Theogonie des Hesiodos* [C.R. XLVIII, 219] (E. Kalinka). Reviewer finds much to criticize and reject, but praises S's appreciation of Hesiod as a poet and other points.—G. Colin, *Le discours d'Hyphride contre Démosthène sur l'argent d'Harpale* [C.R. XLVIII, 181] (C. Rüger). Contains a historical survey, restoration of text (with French translation), and discussion of rhetorical art and style of Hyperides. Text, though inevitably much remains uncertain, is prepared with great skill and ingenuity.—W. Schmid und O. Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*. I, 1, 2. [C.R. XLIV, 12 and XLVIII, 177] (F. Pfister). Far surpasses all other histories of Greek literature. Immense wealth of material makes it a starting-point for all research on problems in this field.—W. G. Becker, *Platons Gesetze und das griechische Familienrecht* [Munich, 1932, Beck. Pp. xvi+363] (H. Leisegang). Determines in detail how far Plato's Laws are based on actual Greek law and what are Plato's own suggestions. A mine of information about Greek law and its history.

—W. Breitenbach, *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der euripideischen Lyrik* [C.R. XLVIII, 220] (W. Morel). Result of most industrious work over many years. About half deals with vocabulary, arranged alphabetically in the various subsections; there are very few omissions. The remainder discusses figures of speech, word-order, reminiscences of earlier poets, etc.—L. Voit, *Δεσφόρος, ein antiker Stilbegriff* [Leipzig, 1934, Dieterich. Pp. 159] (P. Geigenmüller). It would be difficult to improve on V.'s unravelling of the tangled threads of ancient theories of style.

LATIN LITERATURE.—H. Drexler, *Die Komposition von Terenz' Adelphen und Plautus' Rudens* [C.R. XLVIII, 186] (A. Klotz). Examines insertions made by T. and P., especially in Adelphi Act II and Rudens Acts III-V. Acute investigation advances our knowledge of Rudens. But D. is at times misled by inaccurate interpretation, especially in section on Adelphi.—E. Paratore, *Il satyricon di Petronio*. I. *Introduzione*. II. *Commento* [Florence, 1933, le Monnier. Pp. 211 and 446] (R. Helm). Shows wide reading and gives useful indications towards understanding of Petronius' art. But too prolix and undisciplined; 'less would have been more.'—L. Laurand, *Cicéron* [Paris, 1934, 'Les Belles Lettres'. Pp. 331] (K. Schönbberger). This volume contains articles that have already appeared in journals and also a series of new chapters on various subjects. The best and most practical introduction to Cicero.—F. Sauter, *Der römische Kaiserkult bei Martial und Statius* [Stuttgart, 1934, Kohlhammer. Pp. 178] (R. Helm). Continues Weinreich's studies on Martial and collects everything in Statius and Martial that is connected with the glorification of the emperor. In general shows sound judgment.—F. Ghisalberti, *L' 'Ovidius moralizatus' di Pierre Bersuire* [Rome, 1933, Cuggiani. Pp. 136] (F. Lenz). Throws much light on the history and nature of medieval interpretation of Ovid. Prepared with G.'s customary thoroughness.—E. Burck, *Die Erzählungskunst des T. Livius* [Berlin, 1934, Weidmann. Pp. x+244] (A. Klotz). Advances our knowledge of Livy's narrative art, but leaves room for further work in detail. H. Haffter, *Untersuchungen zur altlateinischen Dichtersprache* [C.R. XLIX, 26] (A. Klotz). Shows that generally speaking there is in Roman comedy a clear distinction between the everyday language of *senarii* and the loftier style of the longer metres. Also has a good chapter comparing the styles of Plautus and Terence. Valuable contribution to the interpretation of P. and T.

HISTORY.—G. Colasanti, *'Come Livio scrive che non erra.' Verità geografiche in Livio ed errori della critica moderna* [Lanciano, 1933, Carabba. Pp. 251] (A. Klotz). Defends Livy against critics who prefer Diodorus as authority for Samnite Wars. C.'s method of research is not above criticism; but through his topographical interpretation, based on numerous clear maps, he has considerably advanced our understanding of Livy's account.—G. P. Amato, *La rivolta di Catilina* [C.R. XLVIII, 227] (T. Lenschau). Sees in Catiline not a mere revolu-

tionary, but the last great champion of democracy. Perhaps rather exaggerates C.'s importance, but interesting to read.

PHILOSOPHY.—E. Benz, *Marius Victorinus* [C.R. XLVII, 86] (H. Leisegang). This book, written with great care and understanding, illuminates the important process of transition of Neo-Platonic metaphysics into Christian theology. Clear and penetrating.—V. d'Agostino, *M. Tullio Cicerone, Le Tusculane (libro quarto ed estratti) e il trattato Sui doveri. Introduzione e note* [Turin, 1934, Cojazzi. Pp. xliii+301] (R. Philippson). Concerned mainly with philosophical contents of the two works. Excellent introduction and translation, and many helpful notes.

LANGUAGE AND LEXICOGRAPHY.—C. J. Vooy, *Lexicon Philodemum. Pars Prior* [C.R. XLVIII, 240] (R. Philippson). First part of lexicon of the Philodemus papyri. Far from complete, but useful.—J. Marouzeau, *Lexique de la terminologie linguistique* [C.R. XLVIII, 199] (E. Hermann). A purely practical dictionary of the technical terms of linguistics in French, with their German equivalents. Very useful book of reference for non-specialists.—M. Spilman, *Cumulative sentence building in Latin historical narrative* [Berkeley, 1932, Univ. of California Press] (A. Klotz). Examines subordinate clauses in Caesar, Nepos, Sallust, Livy, and Suetonius. Some useful observations, but no consideration of linguistic development or personality of author.—J. Stenzel, *Philosophie der Sprache* [Munich,

Oldenbourg. Pp. 116] (E. Hermann). Contains many valuable ideas; but reviewer also points out many weaknesses, due partly to insufficient linguistic knowledge.

EPIGRAPHY.—J. Szilágyi, *Inscriptiones tegularum Pannonicarum* [Budapest, 1933. Pp. 109 and 32 plates] (W. Kubitschek). The plates are the most important feature of this warmly welcomed book. The Magyar text is preceded by a short Latin preface, which is sufficient to make the plates intelligible.—G. Drioux, *Les Lingons. Textes et inscriptions antiques* [Paris, 1934, 'Les Belles Lettres.' Pp. iii+200] (T. Lenschau). Careful work collecting all texts and inscriptions bearing on the Lingones down to the end of the Western Empire; contains a large number of inscriptions not yet in the CIL.

PAPYROLOGY.—A. S. Hunt and J. G. Smyly, *The Tebtunis papyri, Vol. III, Part I* [C.R. XLVIII, 87] (K. F. W. Schmidt). Contains a wealth of new material, literary, official, and private documents. Will take a distinguished place among papyrus publications.

ARCHAEOLOGY.—D. M. Robinson, *Excavations at Olynthus. Part VII* [C.R. XLVIII, 132] (G. Lippold). Valuable new material; but reviewer considers reproductions inadequate.—F. Poulsen, *Sculptures antiques de Musées de Provinces Espagnoles* [Copenhagen, 1933, Kgl. Danske Vid. Selsk. With 122 illustrations] (P. Herrmann). Another of P.'s fruitful excursions into terra incognita, and not, like the parallel volume on North Italian provincial museums, confined entirely to portrait sculptures.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

. Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Anderton (B.) *Into the by-ways. Translations into Latin.* Pp. 110. London: University of London Press, 1934. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

Atene e Roma, Serie III—Anno III, N. 1. Gennaio-Marzo 1935. Pp. 78. Florence: Le Monnier. Paper, L. 7.

Atkinson (E. G. A.) and Green (G. E. J.) *Graded Caesar.* Pp. 94. London etc.: Longmans, 1935. Cloth, 1s. 9d.

Bolaffi (A.) *Ludovici Areosti Carmina. Praefatus est, recensuit, Italice vertit, adnotationibus instruxit A. B.* Pp. xxx+133. Pesaro: Officina Polygraphica, 1934. Paper.

Boulenger (F.) *Saint Basile, Aux jeunes gens sur la manière de tirer profit des lettres helléniques. Texte établi et traduit.* (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1935. Paper, 12 fr.

Brady (T. A.) *The Reception of the Egyptian Cults by the Greeks (330-30 B.C.).* Pp. 88. (The University of Missouri Studies, Vol. X, No. 1.) Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri, 1935. Paper, \$1.25.

Breasted (J. H.) *Ancient Times. A History of the Early World.* Second edition, revised

and largely rewritten. Pp. xiii+823; 269 figures, 4 coloured plates, maps. Boston, London, etc.: Ginn, 1935. Cloth, 10s. 6d.

Butler (H. E.) *The Fourth Book of Virgil's Aeneid.* Edited by H. E. B. Pp. v+91. Oxford: Blackwell, 1935. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

Columba (G. M.) *Ricerche storiche. Volume primo. Geografia e geografi del mondo antico.* Pp. viii+359. Palermo: Trimarchi, 1935. Paper, L. 45.

Conway (R. S.) and Johnson (S. K.) *Titi Livi Ab Urbe Condita. Tomus IV. Libri XXVI-XXX.* Oxford: Clarendon Press. Cloth, 8s. 6d.

Cornford (F. M.) *Plato's Theory of Knowledge. The Theaetetus and the Sophist of Plato translated with a running commentary.* Pp. xiv+336. London: Kegan Paul, 1935. Cloth, 15s.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Vol. LXVII. Anicii Manlii Severini Boethii scriptorum partem IV: Philosophiae Consolationis libros quinque recensuit Guil. Weinberger. Pp. xxxi+229. Vienna: Hölder-

- Pichler-Tempsky; Leipzig: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft, 1934. Paper, RM. 16.
- Damerau (P.) Kaiser Claudius II. Gothicus (268-270 n. Chr.). Pp. viii+109. (Klio, Neue Folge, 20. Beiheft.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1934. Paper, M. 6.50 (bound, 8).
- della Pura (E.) Cesare e il bellum civile. Pp. 34. (Dalla rivista "Via dell' Impero", Anno I Numero VI—Ottobre 1934.) Pisa: Pacini, 1934. Paper.
- della Valle (E.) Saggio su la Poesia dell' Antigone. Pp. 121. Bari: Laterza, 1935. Paper, L. 10.
- Diels (H.) Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker. Griechisch und Deutsch von H. D. Fünfte Auflage herausgegeben von W. Kranz. Lieferungen 1-3. Pp. xv+482. Berlin: Weidmann, 1934-5. Paper, RM. 11, 10, 10.
- Donnelly (F. P.) Cicero's Milo. A Rhetorical Commentary. Pp. 123. New York City: Fordham University. Paper, \$1.25.
- Dymock (H. M.), Lee (G. M.), Moore (W. D. H.), Sanderson (H. K. St. J.), Wood (N.) Nineteen Echoes and a Song. Translations, mainly from the Greek and Latin. With an introductory poem by D. Botterill. Cambridge: G. M. Lee (Trinity College), 1935. Paper, 1s. 6d.
- Ernout (A.) Plaute. Tome III. Cistellaria, Curculio, Epidicus. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1935. Paper, 30 fr.
- Fairclough (H. R.) Virgil. With an English translation. In two volumes. II. Aeneid VII-XII; the minor poems. Pp. 583. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press), 1934. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Festa (N.) I frammenti degli stoici antichi, ordinati tradotti e annotati. Vol. II. Pp. 197. Bari: Laterza, 1935. Paper, L. 24.
- Flickinger (M. K.) The 'Aeapria of Sophocles' Antigone. Pp. 82. (Iowa Studies in Classical Philology, No. II.) Iowa: State University, 1935. Paper, \$1.25.
- Fraenkel (E.) Rome and Greek Culture. Pp. 32. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935. Paper, 2s.
- Gigon (O.) Untersuchungen zu Heraklit. Pp. viii+163. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1935. Paper, M. 5 (bound, 6.50).
- Griffith (G. T.) The Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World. Pp. x+340. Cambridge: University Press, 1935. Cloth, 16s.
- Guthrie (W. K. C.) Orpheus and Greek Religion. A study of the Orphic movement. Pp. xix+287; 16 plates, 9 text illustrations. (Methuen's Handbooks of Archaeology.) London: Methuen, 1935. Cloth, 21s.
- Hawes (A. B.) Citizens of long ago. Essays on life and letters in the Roman Empire. Pp. vii+183. New York, London etc.: Oxford University Press, 1934. Cloth, 10s. 6d.
- Henry (P.) Plotin et l'Occident. Firmicus Maternus, Marius Victorinus, Saint Augustin et Macrobe. Pp. 291. (Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, Etudes et Documents, Fasc. 15.) Louvain: "Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense", 1934. Paper, 18 belgas.
- Hesperia. Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Vol. III: No. 4. The American Excavations in the Athenian Agora. Fifth Report. Pp. 311-480; figures and plates. Athens: American School of Classical Studies, 1934. Paper.
- Higbet (G.) An Outline of Homer selected and edited. Pp. 212. Stanier (R. S.) Selections from the Greek Lyric Poets (excluding Pindar) from Kallinos to Bakchylides. Pp. 176. London: Gollancz. Cloth, 4s. and 3s. 6d.
- Hutton (J.) The Greek Anthology in Italy to the Year 1800. Pp. xi+663. (Cornell Studies in English, XXIII.) Ithaca, U.S.A.: Cornell University Press (London: Milford), 1935. Paper, 83.
- Kamal (Y.) Quelques éclaircissements épars sur mes Monumenta Cartographica Africae et Aegypti. Pp. 217. Leiden: Brill, 1935. Paper.
- Knoche (U.) Magnitudo animi. Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Entwicklung eines römischen Wertgedankens. Pp. 93. (Philologus, Supplementband XXVII, Heft 5.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1935. Paper, M. 5.50 (bound, 6.80).
- Kruse (H.) Studien zur offiziellen Geltung des Kaiserbildes im römischen Reiche. Pp. 116. (Studien zur Geschichte u. Kultur des Altertums, XIX 3.) Paderborn: Schöningh, 1934. Paper, RM. 5.80.
- Langerbeck (H.) ΔΟΞΙΣ ΕΠΙΠΥΣΙΜΗ. Studien zu Demokrits Ethik und Bekenntnislehre. Pp. 132. (Neue Philologische Untersuchungen, 10. Heft.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1935. Paper, RM. 9.
- Latte (K.) Sallust. Pp. 60. (Neue Wege zur Antike, II. Reihe: Interpretationen—Heft 4.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1935. Paper, RM. 3.20.
- Laurand (L.) Cicéron. 2^e édition. Pp. 220+5. Cicéron (volume complémentaire). Pp. 221 to 533. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1935, 1934. Paper.
- Lavagnini (B.) Aloisiae Sigaeae Toletanae Satyra Sotadica de Arcanis Amoris et Veneris sive Joannis Meursii Elegantiae Latini Sermonis—auctore Nicolao Choriæ. Introduzione, testo, e appendice critica a cura di B. L. Pp. xx+340. Catania: Prampolini, 1935. Paper, L. 50.
- Lindsay (J.) The Romans. Illustrated by Pearl Binder. Pp. 96. London: Black, 1935. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
- Lockwood (D. P.) A Survey of Classical Roman Literature. Vol. II. Pp. x+383. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1934. Cloth, \$2.50.
- Lyde (L. W.) Contexts in Pindar with reference to the meaning of φέργος. Pp. xiii+58. Manchester: University Press, 1935. Cloth, 5s.
- Malcovati (H.) Cornelii Nepotis quae exstant recensuit H. M. Pp. xxviii+290. (Corpus Script. Lat. Paravianum, N. 60.) Turin etc.: Paravia, 1934. Paper, L. 18.
- Marchesi (C.) Arnobii adversus Nationes libri VII. Recensuit C. M. Pp. xi+435. (Corpus Script. Lat. Paravianum, N. 62.) Turin etc.: Paravia, 1934. Paper, L. 28.
- Marett (R. R.) Lewis Richard Farnell, 1859-1934. Pp. 14. (From the Proceedings of

- the British Academy, Vol. XX.) London: Milford. Paper, 1s.
- Monumenta Palaeographica Vetera*. First Series. Dated Greek Minuscule Manuscripts to the Year 1200. Edited by K. and S. Lake. I. Manuscripts at Jerusalem, Patmos and Athens. Pp. 20; 77 plates. II. Manuscripts in Venice, Oxford and London. Pp. 30; plates 78-151. Boston, U.S.A.: American Academy of Arts and Sciences (London: Christophers), 1934. Portfolios, 40s. each.
- Moore* (B. P.) *The Art of Love*. Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* with verse translation. Pp. xii + 169. London and Glasgow: Blackie, 1935. Cloth, 12s. 6d.
- Murray* (G.) *Aeschylus, The Seven Against Thebes*, translated into English rhyming verse, with introduction and notes. Pp. 89. London: Allen and Unwin, 1935. Cloth, 3s. (paper, 2s.).
- Nachstädt* (W.), *Siebeking* (W.), *Titchener* (J.) *Plutarchus. Moralia*. II. Pp. xxxii + 366 + 136 + 80. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1935. Paper, RM. 17.80 (bound, 19.20).
- Nehrbass* (R.) *Sprache und Stil der Iamata von Epidauros*. Pp. 92. (Philologus, Supplementband XXVII, Heft 4.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1935. Paper, M. 6.
- Neophilologus* XX. 2. Groningen etc.: Wolters. Paper.
- Nouum Testamentum Graece secundum textum Westcotto-Hortianum*. Euangelium secundum Marcum cum apparatu critico nouo plenissimo . . . edidit S. C. E. Legg. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935. Cloth, 21s.
- Oldfather* (W. A.), *Canter* (H. V.), *Perry* (B. E.) *Index Apuleianus*. Pp. liii + 490. (Philological Monographs, No. III.) Middletown, Connecticut: American Philological Association, 1934. Cloth.
- Ollier* (F.) *Le mirage spartiate. Etude sur l'idéalisation de Sparte dans l'antiquité grecque de l'origine jusqu'aux Cyniques*. Pp. ii + 447. Paris: de Boccard, 1933. Paper.
- Orton* (E. F.) *Links with Past Ages*. Pp. xvii + 366; maps and graphs. Cambridge: Heffer, 1935. Cloth, 21s.
- Panitz* (H.) *Mythos und Orakel bei Herodot*. Pp. 73. (Greifswalder Beiträge zur Literatur- und Stilforschung, Heft 7.) Greifswald: Dallmeyer, 1935.
- Perrotta* (G.) *Saffo e Pindaro. Due saggi critici*. Pp. viii + 237. Bari: Laterza, 1935. Paper, L. 16.
- Pfeiffer* (R.) *Die neuen ΔΙΗΓΗΣΕΙΣ zu Kallimachosgedichten*. Pp. 50. (Szb. d. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Abt., Jahrgang 1934, Heft 10.) Munich: Beck, 1934. Paper.
- Post* (L. A.) *The Vatican Plato and its Relations*. Pp. xi + 116. (Philological Monographs published by the American Philological Association, No. IV.) Middletown, Connecticut: American Philological Association, 1934. Cloth.
- Rand* (E. K.) *Studies in the Script of Tours*. II. *The Earliest Book of Tours*. Pp. xviii + 138; 60 plates. Cambridge: U.S.A.: Medieval Academy of America, 1934. Cloth, \$18.50 post-free.
- Renan* (E.) *Prière sur l'Acropole*. With readings from the original manuscript. Edited by E. Vinaver and T. B. L. Webster. Pp. 45. Manchester: University Press, 1934. Paper, 2s.
- Richards* (G. C.) *Cicero. A Study*. Pp. x + 208. London: Chatto and Windus, 1935. Cloth, 8s. 6d.
- Romanes* (N. H.) *Notes on the text of Lucretius*. Pp. 62. Further notes on Lucretius. Pp. 84. Oxford: Blackwell, 1934. Cloth and boards, 5s. each.
- Scullard* (H. H.) *A History of the Roman World from 753 to 146 B.C.* Pp. xv + 504; 3 maps, 2 plans. (Methuen's History of the Greek and Roman World, IV.) London: Methuen, 1935. Cloth, 15s.
- Seckel* (E.) et *Kuebler* (B.) *Gaius. Institutiones*. Septimam editionem curavit B. K. Pp. xxxiii + 269. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1935. Paper, RM. 3.60 (bound, 4.80).
- Spargo* (J. W.) *Virgil the Necromancer*. Studies in Virgilian legends. Pp. xii + 502; illustrations. (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, 10.) Cambridge (U.S.A.): Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1934. Cloth, \$5 or 21s.
- The Traveller*, No. 1. January, 1935. Pp. 11. London: University Travel Guild (23 Cockspur St.) Paper, 4d.
- Thomson* (J. A. K.) *The Art of the Logos*. Pp. 246. London: Allen and Unwin, 1935. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
- Tierney* (M.) *The Parodos in Aristophanes' Frogs*. (Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, XLII C 10, pp. 199-218.) Dublin: Hodges, Figgis (London: Williams and Norgate), 1935. Paper, 1s.
- Tozer* (H. F.) *A History of Ancient Geography*. Second edition with additional notes by M. Cary. Pp. xxiii + 387; 10 maps. Cambridge: University Press, 1935. Cloth, 16s.
- Wenkebach* (E.), *Pfaff* (F.) *Galen in Hippocratis Epidemiarum libros I et II*. Pp. xxxiv + 410. (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum V, 10, 1.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1934. Paper, RM. 28 (bound, 30).
- West* (L. C.) *Roman Gaul. The Objects of Trade*. Pp. xi + 191. Oxford: Blackwell, 1935. Boards, 7s. 6d.
- Wilcox* (A.) *Consolatio ad Liviam prolegomenis, commentario exegetico, indice instructa*. Pp. xxi + 176. Utrecht: van Aelst. Paper.
- Wormald* (R. D.) *Latin Prose Composition*. Pp. viii + 376. London: Arnold, 1934. Cloth, 4s. 6d.
- Wynne-Finch* (H.) *Fracastor: Syphilis or the French Disease*. A poem in Latin hexameters, by Girolamo Fracastoro, with a translation, notes, and appendix by H. W.-F. and an introduction by J. J. Abraham. Pp. vii + 253; illustrations. London: W. Heinemann (Medical Books), 1935. Cloth, 10s. 6d.
- Zancan* (P.) *Il monarcato ellenistico nei suoi elementi federativi*. Pp. viii + 150. (R. Univ. di Padova, Pubbl. della Facoltà di Lett. e Fil., Vol. VII.) Padua: 'Cedam', 1934. Paper, L. 18.

ad-
ited
Pp.
934.

x+
935-

cre-
tius.
loth

man
04 ;
the
on :

titu-
K.
om.
per,

acer.
02 ;
ara-
A.) :
ord),

. II.
ock-

egos.
935-

anes'
Irish
plin :
Nor-

phy.
y M.
dge :

ppo-
xiv +
, 10,
934.

ts of
well,

lego-
e in-
elst.

tion.
cloth,

r the
nexa-
rans-
. and
vii +
mann

i suoi
Univ.
ett. e
1934-